



CHRISTOPHER SNEDDEN

UNDERSTANDING

KASHMIR

AND KASHMIRIS



UNDERSTANDING KASHMIR AND KASHMIRIS

CHRISTOPHER SNEDDEN

Understanding Kashmir and Kashmiris

HURST & COMPANY, LONDON

For Esther and Chris

First published in the United Kingdom in 2015 by
C. Hurst & Co. (Publishers) Ltd.,
41 Great Russell Street, London, WC1B 3PL
© Christopher Snedden, 2015
All rights reserved.
Printed in India

Distributed in the United States, Canada and Latin America by Oxford University Press, 198 Madison Avenue, New York,
NY 10016, United States of America.

The right of Christopher Snedden to be identified as the author of this publication is asserted by him in accordance with the Copyright,
Designs and Patents Act, 1988.

A Cataloguing-in-Publication data record for this book is available from the British Library.

ISBN: 978-1-84904-342-7
epub ISBN: 978-1-84904-622-0

www.hurstpublishers.com

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements

Abbreviations

Glossary

List of Tables

List of Maps

Introduction

Part One: Important Antecedents

What is Kashmir? Who are Kashmiris?

The prestige of ‘Kashmir’

The historical and strategic context for the British

The Sikh Empire and Punjab

Jammu and Jammuities

Part Two: Jammu and Kashmir, 1846–1947

The sale of Kashmir and the creation of J&K

The British in India and the greater region after 1846

Consolidating the princely state

Ongoing British strategic concerns re India’s and J&K’s neighbours

What the Dogras did not control

Challenges to Dogra rule

Part Three: From Princely State to Disputed State

The structure of India and J&K in 1947

The situation in August 1947

Hari Singh’s vacillation and its effects

J&K becomes an international issue

A contentious accession

The ‘People’s Plebiscite’

Part Four: Contemporary, and Divided, J&K

J&K’s five regions

Indian J&K

Pakistan-Administered J&K

Azad Jammu and Kashmir (Azad Kashmir)

Northern Areas/Gilgit-Baltistan

Significant challenges to J&K’s post-1949 status quo

1950: Dixon and the possible break up of J&K

From 1954: India no longer interested in People’s Plebiscite

1960: Indus Waters Treaty

1962 China-India war—and subsequent rivalry

1963: China-Pakistan Border Agreement
1965: second India-Pakistan war
From 1965: China and Pakistan become allies
1971: third India-Pakistan war
From the early 1980s: Siachen Glacier
From 1988: Kashmiris' anti-India uprising
1998: India and Pakistan confirm their nuclear capabilities
1999: the Kargil 'war'
2001: Terrorism
2005: Opening the LOC to J&K-ites

Part Five: Resolving the Kashmir dispute

Attempts to Resolve the Kashmir dispute

The Official Positions of India and Pakistan

The India-Pakistan 'trust deficit'

Since 1947: an increasing desire for independence

One way to resolve the Kashmir dispute: Let the People Decide

Conclusion

Appendixes

Appendix I: The Mountains of, and around, J&K

Appendix II: Maharajas of the Princely State of Jammu and Kashmir

Appendix III: Rules for Visitors to Kashmir

Appendix IV: Wars in, or over, Jammu and Kashmir since 1947

Appendix V: Districts of Jammu and Kashmir

Notes

Bibliography

Index

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I have been writing this book for some time. I have acquired a lot of my information while undertaking research for a previous book about Azad Kashmir. Many of the people who helped with that book vicariously have helped with this one. Once again, I thank you all very much. More specifically, I acknowledge and thank my wife, Diane Barbeler, who actively helped me to clarify my ideas, and who astutely edited this book. It is a far better product for Diane's involvement. I thank Len Johnston from Malmsbury, Victoria, for suggesting the title, and the staff at the State Library of Victoria, Melbourne, for helping me by locating some particularly interesting old maps and old books. This magnificent public edifice and its collection are national and international assets. I thank John Keay for generously allowing me to use an extract from his book *When Men and Mountains Meet: The Explorers of the Western Himalayas 1820–75* in Appendix I. I thank Victoria Schofield for generously giving me a copy of her excellent book *Wavell: Soldier & Statesman* when we met in Pakistan in early 2014. I am very grateful to my publisher, Michael Dwyer, at Hurst and Co., London, and to my Gandhian friend, Tom Weber, from Healesville in outer Melbourne, for their ongoing encouragement and support. I thank the mapmaker, Sebastian Ballard, for the excellent maps. Finally, I thank my parents, Esther and the late Chris Snedden, Canberra, for encouraging and developing my curiosity. I dedicate this book to them.

ABBREVIATIONS

AD	<i>Anno Domini</i> ; Latin for ‘in the year of the/Our Lord’; the period after year 0
BC	Before Christ; the period before year 0
CBMs	Confidence building measures
CENTO	Central Treaty Organization
FATA	Federally Administered Tribal Areas
GBian	A resident of Gilgit-Baltistan
hydel	hydro-electricity
IaK	Indian administered [Jammu and] Kashmir
ISI	(Pakistan’s) Directorate of Inter-Services Intelligence
JKLF	Jammu Kashmir [sic] Liberation Front
J&K	Jammu and Kashmir
KKH	Karakoram Highway
km	kilometres
LOC	Line of Control that has divided J&K since 1972 into Indian J&K and Pakistan-Administered J&K; before 1972, this was known as the ceasefire line
MFN	Most Favoured Nation status (re trade between two nations)
MKA	Ministry of Kashmir Affairs (currently known as the Ministry of Kashmir Affairs and Gilgit-Baltistan)
MW	megawatts
NEFA	North-East Frontier Agency
NWFP	North-West Frontier Province (called Khyber Pakhtunkhwa since 2010)
PaK	Pakistan administered [Jammu and] Kashmir
PLA	(Chinese) People’s Liberation Army
PPP	Pakistan People’s Party
PRC	People’s Republic of China
RIAF	Royal Indian Air Force
Rs	rupees
SAARC	South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation
SEATO	South-East Asia Treaty Organization
sq.	square
UK	United Kingdom
UN	United Nations
UNCIP	United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan
UNMOGIP	United Nations Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan
UNSC	United Nations Security Council

US	United States
USD	United States dollar/ s
USSR	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; also called the Soviet Union
9/11	Terrorist attacks in the United States that occurred on 11 September 2001 (which term uses the US date format: September 11, 2001)

GLOSSARY

<i>azadi</i>	Independence
Baluchis	People who populate Baluchistan; more recently spelt Balochis
Baluchistan	Province in south-western Pakistan; more recently spelt Balochistan
Britisher	A term used by Indians and Pakistanis to denote a person of English, Irish, Scots or Welsh derivation, especially for those involved running the British Indian Empire until 1947
crore	Ten million
<i>darbar</i>	Court, or administration
Indian J&K	Those parts of J&K that India actually controls: Jammu, Kashmir (the Kashmir Valley) and Ladakh
jagir	An area that a ruler granted to a loyal servant for the subordinate's lifetime or on a hereditary basis, including to collect revenue therein. For example, the hereditary Poonch and Chenani jagirs in the Jammu Province of the princely state of J&K.
Jammuite J&K	A person from the Jammu region of J&K Jammu and Kashmir. Depending on the context, this term refers either to the princely state or to the former princely state.
J&K-ites	People from Jammu and Kashmir (term coined by author)
Khalsa Dal	Army of the Sikh Empire
La	Pass, in Tibetan
lakh	One hundred thousand
<i>lashkar</i>	Army
Maharaja	Great ruler
Pakistan-Administered J&K	Those parts of J&K that Pakistan is administering until the People's Plebiscite is conducted: Azad Kashmir and the Northern Areas (now called Gilgit-Baltistan)
People's Plebiscite	Author's term for the United Nations-supervised poll that would enable the people of J&K to determine whether J&K, in its entirety, joins India or Pakistan
<i>Praja Sabha</i>	People's House; the assembly that existed during Maharaja Hari Singh's rule of J&K
Pukhtoon/ s	The majority ethnic group that populates NWFP and south-eastern Afghanistan. Also called Pakhtoons or Pathans or, in Afghanistan, Pushtoons or Pashtoons.
Raja	Ruler
<i>Rishi</i>	Practitioner of a mystical Kashmiri (<i>Rishi</i>) tradition
<i>sepoy</i>	Soldier
<i>tehsil</i>	Sub-district
The Company	East India Company
Turkestan also	'Land of the Turks', roughly comprising eastern (or Russian/Central Asian) and

Turkistan western (Chinese-controlled) parts separated by the Pamir Mountains

LIST OF TABLES

- Table 1: The princely state of Jammu and Kashmir in 1941
- Table 2: Jammu and Kashmir after 1 January 1949, with estimated population in 2001 (Indian J&K) and 1998 (Pakistan-Administered J&K)

LIST OF MAPS

- Map 1: Greater regional map focused on Kashmir
- Map 2: Jammu and Kashmir: pre-partition situation
- Map 3: Jammu and Kashmir: current situation



Map 1: Greater regional map focused on Kashmir



Map 2: Jammu and Kashmir: pre-partition situation



Map 3: Jammu and Kashmir: current situation

INTRODUCTION

The terms ‘Kashmir’ and ‘Kashmiri’ often create confusion. I possibly have added to this confusion by calling this book *Understanding Kashmir and Kashmiris*. I gave the book this title because a longer one that fully reflects its contents would be something like: *The Greater Geo-Political, Historical and Strategic Background to the Creation, Consolidation and Administration of the Princely State of Jammu and Kashmir (J&K); the Significance of its Dogra Rulers and the Lot of their Disparate Subjects; the State’s Important Strategic Significance in the British-Russian Geo-political ‘Great Game’; J&K in 1947 and the Circumstances and Events that Led to Its Isolation and Disintegration, including the British Withdrawal of Paramountcy; How the Kashmir dispute started; Some Major Changes to the Status Quo in J&K since the 1949 Ceasefire; the Current Situation in (Divided) J&K; and, Why J&K is Never Likely to be Reunified*. This longer ‘title’ says it all—very awkwardly. Another title might be: *Everything you need to know about Jammu and Kashmir and the Kashmir dispute*. My shorter, and actual, title is the most approachable and memorable.

I have used the title *Understanding Kashmir and Kashmiris* deliberately so that I can explain the anomalies concerning the two entities embedded in it. This title also enables me to discuss these entities in their broad and narrow senses and to explain the major issues involving or surrounding them. As we shall see, the term ‘Kashmir’ means different things in J&K, India and Pakistan. Similarly, there are people who call themselves Kashmiris, some of whom are not actually of this ethnicity. One reason for these anomalies arises from the circumstance that outsiders often used the name ‘Kashmir’ as shorthand for the (former) princely state of Jammu and Kashmir and for its ruler, or maharaja. This meant that both the maharaja and his state were called ‘Kashmir’, while his subjects were called ‘Kashmiris’—even though J&K actually included other geographic areas and ethnicities. When my publisher suggested that a better title for this book would be *Understanding Kashmir and the Kashmiris*—thankfully, he had not seen the longer version above that I had (very briefly) contemplated—I emphatically said no as the definite article made this term far too specific.

I have written this book to explain the India-Pakistan dispute over J&K—the so-called ‘Kashmir dispute’—to a generalist audience. I do not offer an inclusive, tell-all history of J&K that mounts any arguments.¹ Nor do I provide detailed legal and diplomatic ‘chapter and verse’ about who did what and when in discussions about J&K involving India and Pakistan or in the United Nations Security Council. Many other books deal with such specifics, often in great detail. Rather, this book provides sufficient information and context for a reader to understand the dispute’s broad historic and geo-strategic antecedents and circumstances, the salient aspects of the J&K region, and the protracted dispute over it. This includes placing J&K at the centre of a greater geo-political region that stretches from Kashgar to Karachi, Khiva to Calcutta, and Herat to Lhasa. (See [Map 1](#).) Both before and after its creation, J&K conducted trade and other relations with many places and rulers in this vast area, including via the so-called ‘Silk Route’. More recently, after 1586, Kashmir itself was dominated by Mughals from India, then by Afghans based in Kandahar and Kabul, then by Sikhs from Punjab, and finally by Dogras from Jammu. The British also ‘played’ strategically in this greater region. Currently, there is still important ‘trade’ going on in the greater region, although this is more to do with radical ideas or militants/ terrorists coming from western areas to attack what they consider to be ‘Hindu- or Indian-dominated Kashmir’ or the Kashmiris’ more tolerant version of Sufi-inspired

Islam.

I have taken this approach of writing a broader book for a more generalist audience because, invariably, most books that I have read about J&K provide little or no history, background or context about either J&K or its people. Rather, most books about J&K start from 1947 and discuss either the India-Pakistan dispute over J&K or the popular Kashmir Valley, which has received even more attention since ethnic Kashmiris began their anti-India uprising in 1988. This makes the Kashmir dispute appear a little bit like a rabbit pulled out of a hat: it is a huge thing that suddenly, magically and mysteriously materializes from a small headpiece with seemingly very few, if any, antecedents. There is, however, considerably more to the contest over J&K than just India-Pakistan relations and the Kashmir Valley. First and foremost, this dispute involves people. Too often, the people of J&K—all of them—have been forgotten, ignored or overlooked. Indeed, India and Pakistan have deliberately sidelined them from all attempts to resolve their dispute over J&K. Nevertheless, the people of J&K constitute an essential element to the Kashmir dispute. This is because the dispute is about their homelands. Furthermore, they themselves actually instigated the Kashmir dispute in 1947, and not Pukhtoon tribesmen from Pakistan, as India has long claimed and in which claim Pakistan has long, and surprisingly, acquiesced. Additionally, as I have argued elsewhere, given the total inability of India and Pakistan to resolve their dispute over J&K, only the people of J&K can resolve this bitter issue.² Comprehending their circumstances and plight helps a reader to more fully understand my claim—and possibilities of resolving this dispute. Second, history matters. To fully understand the Kashmir dispute, we need to understand issues such as how and why the British constructed the princely state in 1846; what this diverse entity geographically and politically comprised; how it was successfully consolidated and protected; what administrative ‘glue’ held the state together; the disparate nature of the religious beliefs of the people who populated the princely state; and, how these disunified people were (mis)ruled. Such information provides a fuller, more rounded, more complete narrative. Importantly, it also explains at least three matters: 1) why India’s largest, and one of its most prestigious, princely states quickly fragmented soon after the British stopped supporting J&K’s ethnic Dogra rulers in 1947; 2) why J&K quickly became a bitter ‘bone of contention’ between India and Pakistan; and, 3) why the former princely state is never likely to be reunified.

As part of this book’s discussion about ‘Kashmir’ and ‘Kashmiris’, other interesting and meaningful aspects of J&K’s history, geography and culture emerge. These stories are well worth relating. For instance, without having the significant support of the surprisingly little known first ruler of J&K, Maharaja Gulab Singh from Jammu, the British may never have conquered Sikh-dominated Punjab in the 1840s, nor might they have survived the 1857 ‘Mutiny’. An associated and curious matter concerns why the victorious British hastily sold the prestigious region of Kashmir, to Jammu’s north, to Gulab Singh one week after winning this famed and relatively prosperous region from the Sikhs in a very hard fought war. Had the British retained direct control of the respective Jammu and Kashmir regions and then administered this combined entity themselves thereafter, the dispute over J&K’s international status may never have occurred. This is because the British would then have been compelled to determine this region’s international fate in 1947—and not the indecisive ruler of J&K, Maharaja Lieutenant-General Sir Hari Singh (hereafter Maharaja Hari Singh). Another important matter involves examining how, and why, the British actively ‘played’ the shadowy ‘Great Game’ against the Russians (later Soviets) from the 1800s. This examination shows that J&K was a major and strategically significant area in Russo-British imperial rivalry. Because of this factor, the British watched J&K maharajas closely while concurrently tolerating their autocratic behaviour. On occasions, the British also suffered disastrous losses and setbacks in their strategic contest with the

Russians. This contest only really ended when the British departed the Indian subcontinent in 1947. Thereafter, a new, more direct and strategically narrower—but no less important—‘game’ in which J&K was the sole stake came into being. Played ostensibly by India and Pakistan, but with China involved somewhat on J&K’s eastern periphery, this deadly serious and ongoing contest is the so-called Kashmir dispute.

My overall aim with this book, therefore, is to provide a comprehensive historical, geo-strategic and political narrative for ‘Understanding Kashmir and Kashmiris’. In [Part I](#), I explain the differing terminology that applies to J&K and some important aspects that led to J&K’s creation in 1846. This discussion also explains why the Kashmir region was famous and prestigious. In [Part II](#), I analyse various aspects of the princely state of Jammu and Kashmir itself, including how it was consolidated and ruled, or misruled, by its ethnic Dogra rulers. [Part III](#) concerns J&K’s political and administrative situation in 1947. It also explains the maharaja’s accession dilemma and why the desirable, and desired, princely state quickly fragmented after the British departed the subcontinent. [Part IV](#) deals with J&K’s structure and situation since the United Nations-brokered ceasefire came into place in 1949, and some major changes to the status quo in, or impacting on, J&K since then. The final part, [Part V](#), provides details about attempts made to resolve the Kashmir dispute and it proposes one way to resolve this matter. A Conclusion and five appendixes then follow, with the appendixes providing additional information about J&K.

The Kashmir dispute is now sixty-seven years old. This makes it older than more than ninety per cent of Indians and Pakistanis. Its longevity surpasses the average life expectancy of a Pakistani male (65.16 years) and that of an Indian male (66.68 years).³ If it were an Australian citizen (as I am), it would be entitled to a state-paid pension! Despite this humorous but tragic fact, sixty-seven years is a brief time in the history of the Indian subcontinent. Wistfully, some of my friends in J&K, India and Pakistan, tell me that the Kashmir dispute could continue for another two-thirds of a century. This book provides sufficient background information for a reader to understand why such a woeful scenario is possible. Unless stated otherwise, all opinions in this book are mine. Similarly, I take responsibility for all errors.

PART ONE

IMPORTANT ANTECEDENTS

What is Kashmir? Who are Kashmiris?

Terminology is important, especially if its use is clear. The term ‘Kashmir’ refers to the former princely ‘State of Jammu and Kashmir’, to use its official title. Under British rule of the Indian subcontinent that ended in 1947, people called this entity ‘Kashmir’. This practice has created confusion for many people because there is more than one interpretation about what actually comprises Kashmir. When Pakistanis use the term ‘Kashmir’, they often mean ‘Jammu and Kashmir’. Equally, they could mean the Kashmir Valley, or even Azad Kashmir, which region of J&K is under their direct control. The term ‘Kashmir’ also is very important for Pakistanis because the name of their nation, Pakistan, is an acrostic in which the k stands for Kashmir. This refers to Kashmir in the broad sense, meaning J&K. That said, Pakistanis generally forget about the significance of the k in the acrostic Pakistan and, instead, when talking about Kashmir they often appear to be referring more narrowly to the Kashmir Valley. Indeed, Pakistanis, most of whom are Sunni Muslims, appear to be far more interested in the ‘real’ Kashmir—that is, the Kashmir Valley—than in the two other areas of J&K controlled by India: Jammu and Ladakh. This may be for religious reasons. As in Pakistan, Sunni Muslims comprise the majority population of Kashmir, whereas they are a minority in Jammu, while almost all Muslims in Ladakh are Shias. Conversely, when Indians use the term ‘Kashmir’, they generally always mean the Kashmir Valley, as invariably do people living in the neighbouring regions of Jammu and Ladakh. When international relations practitioners use the term ‘Kashmir’, they probably are referring to J&K because they generally understand that the term ‘the Kashmir dispute’ refers to this whole region that was once undivided. When tourists use the term ‘Kashmir’, they invariably are referring to the Indian-controlled Kashmir Valley, which has long been a very popular tourist destination.

I use the term ‘Kashmir’ throughout this book to refer specifically to the Kashmir Valley region, also sometimes called the Vale of Kashmir. As we shall see, the particular geo-political entity of Kashmir has existed for thousands of years. It long predates the creation of the princely state of Jammu and Kashmir in 1846, which was often called ‘Kashmir’ because of the fame and prestige of the Kashmir region and which has always been J&K’s best known, most attractive and most popular part. Historically, Kashmir equates to the Kashmir Valley. Contemporaneously, this Kashmir is roughly at the geographic centre of J&K in the sense that this region is the only one in post-1947 J&K that has physical connections and borders with the disputed entity’s other four regions.¹ Culturally, population-wise and by reputation, Kashmir is also at the political centre of post-1947 J&K.

Given the dual uses of the term ‘Kashmir’ to denote the specific region of Kashmir and as shorthand for the Dogra-ruled ‘State of Jammu and Kashmir’, I also need to explain how I label this latter political entity. I use the term ‘J&K’ to refer either to the princely state or to the post-1947 entity of J&K that India and Pakistan are still disputing possession of. Their dispute concerns all of

the areas that comprise the former princely state. Before 15 August 1947, J&K comprised three provinces: Jammu; Kashmir; the Frontier Districts. Two of Kashmir Province's three districts, Anantnag and Baramulla, roughly equated to the Kashmir Valley. (Much of Kashmir Province's third district, Muzaffarabad, was located to the west of the Kashmir Valley.) Since J&K was divided by fighting in 1947–48, it has comprised five regions. Listed alphabetically, these comprise: Azad ('Free') Jammu and Kashmir, popularly called 'Azad Kashmir'; Jammu; Kashmir; Ladakh; the Northern Areas, which has been called 'Gilgit-Baltistan' since 2009. India controls three of these regions: Jammu; Kashmir; Ladakh. It claims the other two regions of Azad Kashmir and Gilgit-Baltistan that Pakistan is administering until the Kashmir dispute is resolved. The United Nations Security Council (UNSC) calls the issue of resolving J&K's international status 'the India-Pakistan Question'. This is a euphemism for the more commonly used term 'the Kashmir dispute', which term I also use throughout this book. This is the only time in this book when I use the term 'Kashmir' other than in relation to the Kashmir Valley.

Now to the second question 'Who are Kashmiris?'. The term 'Kashmiri' when used narrowly—and by me throughout this book—refers to the residents who populate the Kashmir Valley region, that is, Kashmir. Almost all of these people are ethnic Kashmiris. A small number are Gujjars and Bakarwals, who respectively are cowherds and shepherds living in the Kashmir Valley's uplands. An even smaller number are Sikhs whose descendants moved to Kashmir from Punjab as bureaucrats or as landowning supporters of the Dogra rulers. Ethnic Kashmiris have a history and culture that goes back thousands of years. They have long ago assimilated invaders, immigrants and interlopers, and their descendants, from Iran, Afghanistan, Central Asia, India and Tibet. Nowadays, most Kashmiris are practitioners of Islam, although their position as the majority religious community in Kashmir is a relatively recent development dating from around the late 1400s. Prior to that, most Kashmiris were Buddhists or Hindus. Although most Kashmiris now are Muslims, Kashmir has also always had a small, but significant, community of Hindus, called Pandits. In 1947, these Hindus amounted to about six per cent of the Kashmiri population. However, since disenchanted Muslim Kashmiris began their anti-India uprising in the Kashmir Valley in 1988, many Hindu Pandits have left Kashmir. They now live as refugees in the neighbouring region of Jammu, to Kashmir's south, and in India. Similarly, since 1988 and the serious downturn (until recently) in tourism in Kashmir, some Muslim Kashmiris, particularly young men, have left the Kashmir region for the politically safer and/ or better trading environment of India. Some Muslim Kashmiris also went to Azad Kashmir or Pakistan, chiefly to train as anti-India militants. Many apparently now wish to return home. Small numbers of ethnic Kashmiris also live in other parts of J&K. There are Kashmiris who live in areas that border the Kashmir Valley, including Kishtwar (Kishtawar), Bhadarwah, Doda and Ramban, in Jammu in Indian J&K, and in the Neelum and Leepa valleys of northern Azad Kashmir. Since 1947, many ethnic Kashmiris and their descendants also can be found in Pakistan. Invariably, Kashmiris in Azad Kashmir and Pakistan are Muslims.

Confusingly, the term 'Kashmiri' also has wider connotations and uses. Some people in Azad Kashmir call themselves 'Kashmiris'. This is despite most Azad Kashmiris not being of Kashmiri ethnicity. Indeed, most of their ethnic, cultural and historical links have been, and remain, with areas to the south and west of Azad Kashmir, chiefly Punjab and the North-West Frontier Province (NWFP), now called Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Province. Nevertheless, Azad Kashmiris call themselves Kashmiris because of their region's historical connections with the former princely state of J&K that popularly was called Kashmir. Some Azad Kashmiris also call themselves Kashmiris simply because their region's official name, Azad Jammu and Kashmir, has the word Kashmir in it. (Using the same

logic, Azad Kashmiris could call themselves ‘Jammuities’, which historically and culturally would be more accurate, or even ‘Azadi-ites’.) Importantly, some of the so-called ‘Pakistanis’ living in the United Kingdom also call themselves Kashmiris. Many of these people (and their descendants) actually are Azad Kashmiris, from Mirpur, in southern Azad Kashmir. Increasingly, these people are calling themselves ‘Kashmiris’ because of their links with the former princely state of ‘Kashmir’. Because of the confusion surrounding the term ‘Kashmiri’ and because the rulers of the disparate citizens in the princely state were not able to develop a unified, endearing, acceptable sense of state-wide identity among their subjects, I have coined the term ‘J&K-ites’. This refers to people who either were residents of the extant princely state of J&K or who are residents of the post-1947 former princely state of J&K. While I like being inventive, I actually find this term clearer and more accurate than the often misused and misunderstood term ‘Kashmiris’. I use the term ‘J&K-ites’ throughout this book.

Some politicised terms also are used to describe parts of J&K. These terms include the words ‘occupied’ and ‘held’. India claims ‘that the entire State of Jammu and Kashmir is an integral part of India’ because Maharaja Hari Singh acceded to India in 1947.² Therefore, India officially calls those parts of J&K that Pakistan is administering ‘Pakistan-Occupied Kashmir’ (‘POK’). Similarly, India refers to ‘Chinese-Occupied Kashmir’ for the Aksai Chin (‘desert of white stones’) area that India claims but which is under China’s control. India is very sensitive, and somewhat insistent, that this rather tortuous terminology be used, particularly on maps, which is a major reason why some books about India have none. Indian opprobrium about ‘incorrect’ maps and ‘distasteful’ books is increasing. Nevertheless, the term ‘POK’ causes confusion as Indians use it in three ways: 1) to refer to all of Pakistan-Administered J&K, which comprises Azad Kashmir and the Northern Areas/Gilgit-Baltistan; 2) to refer to what Pakistanis and locals call ‘Azad Kashmir’; 3) to refer to what Pakistanis and locals called the ‘Northern Areas/Gilgit-Baltistan’. The term ‘Azad Kashmir’ is particularly distasteful to Indians because ‘azad’ means ‘free’—in this case, free from India and Indian control. (Initially, when Azad Kashmir came into being on 24 October 1947, two days before Maharaja Hari Singh’s accession to India, it meant being free from the Maharaja’s control.) I have met Indians who cannot bring themselves to say ‘Azad Kashmir’. Instead, they use POK to refer to this region. The difficulties are compounded when our discussions move to talk about the Northern Areas/Gilgit-Baltistan, which for Indians also is POK. Fortuitously, many Indians find one of the terms ‘Northern Areas’ or ‘Gilgit-Baltistan’ less problematic to use than Azad Kashmir as these former are inspired by geography, not politics. Nevertheless, in conversations with Indians, I often need to clarify which exact entity they are talking about when they use the catch-all ‘POK’. The Kashmir dispute raises strong emotions among Indians—and Pakistanis.

For their part, Pakistanis call Indian-controlled J&K, which comprises the regions of Jammu, Kashmir and Ladakh, ‘Indian-Occupied Kashmir’ (‘IOK’) or ‘Indian-Held Kashmir’ (IHK). Pakistan believes that India is an occupying power maintaining its presence in J&K by force against the wishes of the people. This may be the case in Kashmir, but people are strongly pro-India in Jammu and Ladakh. They feel neither occupied nor held and want to be citizens of India. This relates to another erroneous and confusing factor: when Pakistanis are talking about Indian-Occupied Kashmir, they often are only referring to the Kashmir Valley. This is because Pakistanis have little interest in (non-Muslim-majority, pro-India) Jammu and Ladakh. Finally, other nations, possibly trying to be evenhanded or unemotive, talk of ‘Indian-Controlled Kashmir’ and ‘Pakistan-Controlled Kashmir’. In 1949, the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan (UNCIP) longwindedly denoted Pakistan-Administered Kashmir as ‘the area of the State of Jammu and Kashmir under the control of

the Pakistan High Command'. More specifically, UNCIP referred to Azad Kashmir as 'Western Kashmir', a term I have also heard Indians use occasionally. Similarly, UNCIP used 'Eastern Kashmir' to refer to Indian J&K. The problem was UNCIP also used 'Western Kashmir' to include Gilgit and/or Baltistan, while it used 'Eastern Kashmir' generally to refer to, or infer, the Kashmir Valley.³ More recently, the United Nations itself sometimes uses the term 'held' when talking about J&K. In a document with population estimates from 2003–12 for the nations of the world, it talks of 'the Indian-held part of Jammu and Kashmir, the final status of which has not yet been determined' and 'the Pakistan-held part of Jammu and Kashmir, the final status of which has not yet been determined'.⁴ Such terminology invariably irks New Delhi.

Unless quoting, I do not use any terms in this book that include the words 'occupied' or 'held'. Instead, I use the term 'Indian J&K' to refer to those parts of J&K under India's direct control and 'Pakistan-Administered J&K' for those parts of J&K that Pakistan is administering, as per various United Nations' resolutions, until the Kashmir dispute is finally resolved. I also refer to each of J&K's five regions individually as Azad Kashmir, Jammu, Kashmir, Ladakh, and either the Northern Areas or Gilgit-Baltistan, depending on the historical context. Following the renaming of the Northern Areas in 2009, the term 'Gilgit-Baltistan' better reflects this region's geographic components of Gilgit in the north and Baltistan in the south and east. Generally, however, I use the older term 'Northern Areas', unless I am speaking about events that have happened since this region was renamed. This older term relates to the region's important strategic position in the north of J&K.

This book also discusses other places and regions that have had their names changed since 1947. One such region is the North-West Frontier Province. The British created NWFP in 1901, essentially by severing and renaming Punjab Province's north-western 'Frontier Districts'. Before NWFP's creation, the Frontier Districts region was often also called the 'North-Western Frontier Region'. I try to use these terms in this book in their correct historical context. I also try to use them in a way that avoids confusion with J&K's largest province, which had a similar name: the Frontier Districts Province. Since April 2010, NWFP has been called 'Khyber Pakhtunkhwa'. This province of Pakistan is contiguous with Pakistan-Administered J&K. It also has been historically involved with, and important to, the former princely state of J&K. Unless speaking about events since this renaming in 2010, I use the term 'NWFP'. Similarly, I often use older terminology to describe an area or place, also providing its modern name in brackets when appropriate. For example, 'Merv, (now Mari, Turkmenistan)'. Some of these places sometimes have two spellings, usually similar. For example, Baramula is now generally spelt Baramulla, while Baluchistan is spelt Balochistan. I also use modern terminology to locate an area that may have been called something else before 1947. For example, Gujarat, which came into existence as a separate Indian state in 1960. (Prior to that, it was part of Bombay state.) Depending on the historical context, I have provided either miles and square miles and/ or kilometres (km) and square kilometres (sq. km). I also have chosen to employ the traditional terms of 'BC' (Before Christ) and 'AD' (*Anno Domini*, Latin for 'in the year of the/Our Lord'). This is both for convenience and because most references that I consulted employed these designations.

Speaking of time, it is worth making three points here about the term 'India'. First, invaders, traders and travellers, particularly Persians, Greeks and Arabs, long ago devised this name. For them, the easterly areas beyond the large and difficult-to-cross Sindhu (Indus) River respectively was 'Hind', 'Ind' or 'al-Hind'.⁵ From this derivation of Indus/Sindhu also came the terms 'Hindustan' ('Land of Hindus'), 'India', and the 'Indian subcontinent'. Similarly, for sailors coming from the west, the sea that they crossed was 'Al Bahr al Hindi', or the 'Indian Sea' (later the 'Indian Ocean'). Second, even though parts of the subcontinent became civilised as early as 2,600 BC and even though

people often called this geographic entity 'India', only the British created a whole and unified political entity called 'India', which they of course ruled. Pre British, no one dynasty or kingdom controlled the entire subcontinent, although two went close. One was the Mauryan Empire around 250 BC, which enjoyed great influence, including because of Emperor Ashoka's conversion to, and propagation of, Buddhism and pacifism. Another was the Mughal Empire under its strongly Islamic emperor, Aurangzeb (ruled 1658–1707). Both empires included much, but not all, of the territory that later became India. However, unlike the British Indian Empire, neither included lands in the far south that essentially comprise areas that are now part of the Indian states of Kerala and Tamil Nadu. Conversely, the British Indian Empire did not include areas outside the subcontinent that the Mauryans or Mughals had once controlled, particularly Afghanistan. Third, while only the British politically unified India, they also divided it. In 1947, they partitioned, or divided, the subcontinent into the new independent dominions of India and Pakistan. Ironically, since the British carved up the subcontinent, much of the Indus River from which India derives its name now flows through Pakistan, not India.

This raises the question of my use of the terms 'British' and 'India'. I rarely use the term 'English', even though it was the mercantile East India Company and its employees from England that first gained a toehold in Mughal India in the early 1600s. Instead, I use the terms 'British' or 'Britishers', as subcontinentals often call them. These are broader terms that include the various people of English, Irish, Scots and Welsh derivation who ran the British Indian Empire. This included the princely state of Jammu and Kashmir, which Britishers were instrumental in creating in 1846 and where a number of them served in important positions and locations until 1947. I also use the term 'India' in more than one way. I use it singularly to mean the unified political entity that the British created on the subcontinent. Essentially, they completed this 'project' by defeating the Sikhs for a second time in 1849 (they first fought in 1846), after which the British obtained direct or indirect control of almost all of the important and populous areas in the Indian subcontinent. Thereafter, the British directly administered roughly two-thirds of India themselves, which I call 'British India'. They also allowed local princes to rule various parts of India under British paramountcy, or overlordship. Each state was a 'Dependent and Subordinate Native State'. One example of such a state was J&K.⁶ I call these combined areas 'Princely India', which comprised about one third of the British Indian Empire. Until 1947, British India plus Princely India were known as the 'Indian Empire', the 'British Indian Empire', or simply as 'India', which terms, for convenience, I use synonymously. Similarly, I often put British troops together with 'native' or Indian troops and call them 'the British Indian Army' or simply 'the Indian Army'. British officers always commanded this force. I also use the term 'India' for the entity that remained after East and West Pakistan were created in 1947. This modern entity is also called the 'Union of India', or 'Bharat', a term used in the 1961 Census of (Indian) J&K, for example. The context should make it clear about which 'India' I am talking.

The role of religion is also a factor that needs to be understood in relation to both J&K and J&K-ites. In 1947, religious differences played a major part in instigating the dispute over whether J&K should join India or Pakistan. The term 'Hindustan' mentioned above was once used widely to refer to India.⁷ While its literal translation was the 'Land of Hindus', this term also denoted all of India and its people, regardless of their actual religion. For example, the so-called 'Hindustani Fanatics' in the 1890s, who were located in an area of NWFP not far from J&K, were all (Indian) Muslims, not Hindus. In the 1940s, the term 'Hindustan' became problematic as politicians, both Indian and British, increasingly compared and contrasted Hinduism and Islam for political purposes. This included the All-India Muslim League's 1940 'Lahore Resolution' that formally called for separate

homelands for Hindus and Muslims and which demand ultimately resulted in the creation of Pakistan as a homeland for the subcontinent's Muslims. This division of British India reflected a concept that a religion, in this case, Islam, was a monolith and that this was a good basis on which to create a new nation, in this case, Pakistan. However, neither Hinduism nor Islam is a monolith. Furthermore, neither religion in the subcontinent is fully free from the influence of the other. Hinduism itself is extremely broad and difficult to define. Furthermore, even 'with all its multiple deities, [it is] basically a monotheistic faith' that is able to accommodate a myriad number of beliefs and practices, including a path for skeptics or atheists known as *Lokayata/Carvaka*.⁸ Hinduism's broadness is reflected in the many Hindu beliefs and practices found throughout India and in J&K, particularly around Jammu. Not surprisingly, in 1947, almost all J&K Hindus wanted the princely state to join India in which Hindus would comprise the most number of citizens. So too did Buddhists in neighbouring Ladakh. They felt very comfortable with J&K joining this secular nation in which the state had no interest in a person's religion. Conversely, the fact that Islam would dominate Pakistan and Pakistani politics made such people feel uncomfortable.

Similarly, Islam is not a monolith. Subcontinental Muslims have long followed various interpretations of Islam: Sunni; Shia; Ismaili; Sufi-inspired; Deobandi; Barelvi; Ahl-e-Hadith; Salafi; Wahabi; and Ahmadi/ Qadiani, which some Pakistani Muslims, unlike most Indian and Kashmiri Muslims, oppose violently as they consider Ahmadis to be apostates. In 1947, British, Indian and Pakistani leaders assumed that Islam was a sufficiently coherent and unified polity to divide British India into India and Pakistan. This was a simplistic solution based on religion to a very complex problem that was more about resolving differences between political personalities, some perceived political and economic inferiority for some Muslims as a minority community in 'Hindu' India, and the British need after World War II to withdraw quickly from its increasingly recalcitrant colony. At the time, severing British India into three parts—comprising two political entities—seemed to be a timely and seemingly pragmatic solution to a difficult problem. Even so, most Indian Muslims chose not to leave their homelands in 1947 and resettle in either of Pakistan's two wings, with one result being that India currently has about the same number of Muslims as Pakistan. Similarly, many Kashmiri Muslims, whose community did not suffer from a 'majority-minority complex', did not want J&K to join Pakistan, partly because 'secular thinking ... reflected the aspirations of the Kashmiris' and partly because of the deep, and abiding, feudalism and tribalism in West Pakistan, with which region J&K would have been linked geographically and politically had J&K joined Pakistan.⁹ (Equally, many non-Kashmiri Muslims in J&K, particularly in the provinces of Jammu and the Frontier Districts, were strongly attracted by Pakistan for reasons of religious solidarity.) In 1971, Pakistanis again discovered that Islam was not a monolith when severely disenchanted Bengali Muslims in East Pakistan fought and secured, with some significant assistance from India's Armed Forces, an independent Bangladesh ('Land of the Banglas', i.e. Bengalis, or the 'Bengal Nation').¹⁰ Islam had not been sufficient to hold the two divided and disparate wings of Pakistan together. Currently, in Pakistan, Taliban elements, Islamic 'fundamentalist' groups in southern Punjab, and/or sectarian Sunni Muslims intolerant of Shias and other 'lesser' Muslims or alleged blasphemers or apostates, are trying to impose their own (invariably hardline) interpretation of Islam on Pakistanis, the majority of whom seemingly are tolerant people. Similarly, some Pakistani Muslims in Balochistan are disenchanted and want independence from Pakistan.

The significance of this short discussion about Hinduism and Islam in the subcontinent is that the issue of religion has not yet been resolved. Despite its formal name of the 'Islamic Republic of Pakistan', Pakistan is still trying to irrevocably determine whether it should be a state for Muslims or

an Islamic state. If it is the latter, which many Pakistanis seem to desire, which type of Islam should prevail (which may be the harder question to answer)? And how should Pakistan's Hindu, Christian, Sikh and other minorities, who comprise about five per cent of the population of this supposed Islamic republic, be treated? India has fared better with its religious struggles. Hinduism's broadness has helped foster secularism which, in turn, has helped India's unification. (By emulating India's secular approach, Pakistan possibly could neutralise its own religious zealots and satisfy its minorities.) However, some disenchanted religious minorities in India have engaged in armed insurrections to try to secure their own independence. This includes Sikhs in Punjab, Christians in India's north-eastern states of Mizoram and Nagaland, and Kashmiri Muslims. One negative aspect of their liberation struggles is that some Indians, often Hindus, question these people's loyalty to India, particularly Muslims in Kashmir. Equally, some pro-India Kashmiri Muslims—yes, there are such people—feel that Indians (still) mistrust them. Some Indians, mainly Hindus, also question the loyalty of Muslims in India, believing (fallaciously) that, by virtue of the 'logic' of partition in which Muslim-majority areas became Pakistan, Indian Muslims invariably must be pro-Pakistan. These Indians' fears are fuelled because some Pakistanis feel that, because Pakistan was set up as a homeland for Muslims, it must protect and defend the subcontinent's Muslims. In my experience, most Muslims in India are pro-India, with little inclination to visit, let alone move to, Pakistan. Indeed, one of the most pro-India people I have ever met is an Indian Muslim. He certainly doesn't want any Pakistani Muslim looking after his interests! Similarly, most people in Pakistan's minority communities want to stay in Pakistan, provided they obtain fair treatment. Conversely, many Kashmiris—but not all—dislike India and want to be free from it. Equally, however, not all Kashmiri Muslims want to join Pakistan. Religious communities in South Asia also are not monoliths.

The prestige of 'Kashmir'

The name 'Kashmir' has an almost mystical quality. It conjures up images of boatmen in *shikaras* on mirrored lakes (as on this book's front cover), majestic mountains, poplar-lined roads, intricately-carved houseboats for use by tourists, and beautiful handicrafts, particularly shawls. Equally, the name 'Kashmir' reminds one of the Kashmir dispute. It is important to understand why the princely state of Jammu and Kashmir was popularly known as 'Kashmir' during its existence, why the dispute over the international status of J&K is called 'the Kashmir dispute', and why the ruler of J&K also was known as 'Kashmir', even though he came from the region of Jammu, a separate and distinctly different region to Kashmir's immediate south. (Similarly, the maharaja's subjects were generally called 'Kashmiris', even though most were not ethnically so.) The reason for these uses of the term 'Kashmir' is easy to explain. It was because the geographic region of Kashmir was the most acclaimed, popular and visited part of the princely state of J&K during its official existence from 1846 until 1952.

Kashmir's fame was not a new phenomenon. Kashmir and Kashmiris have enjoyed renown going back to antiquity. As a consequence, in 1947, India and Pakistan were both keen to obtain possession of the prestigious princely state of 'Kashmir'. There were a number of reasons for their desire. First, J&K was the largest 'native', or princely, state in India, comprising 84,471 sq. miles (218,800 sq. km) in area.¹¹ Second, J&K had strategic significance. Apart from sharing international borders with China and Afghanistan, three major rivers flowed through the princely state and into Punjab (then undivided): the Indus, Jhelum and Chenab. The Ravi River also ran adjacent to south-eastern J&K and provided a border with Punjab. Third, acquiring J&K also meant obtaining the famous and

prestigious Kashmir region. This was the prize that both dominions wanted in 1947. In 2014, India and Pakistan both seemingly still want to possess Kashmir. While I generally use the past tense throughout the following discussion, much of what I have written still applies today.

The famed region of Kashmir has long been a settled, fairly self-contained and significant entity that has long captured people's attention, particularly visitors and tourists. In 1947, Kashmir was a geographically identifiable region that was called the Vale of Kashmir or the Kashmir Valley. It comprised the bulk of Kashmir Province, with the only non-Kashmiri area of this province being part of Muzaffarabad District to Kashmir's west. The Kashmir Valley consisted of a flat alluvial plain approximately 85 miles (135 km) long by 25 miles (40 km) wide and approximately 6,000 sq. miles (15,500 sq. km) in area. Large mountains completely surrounded this plain, making the Vale, when seen from the air, appear like an oversized elongated arena. As we shall see, Kashmir's prestige was due largely to its scenic beauty, to its history, glamour and reputation, and to its popularity as a tourist destination. In 1947, these factors added greatly to J&K's desirability for India and Pakistan. Additionally, however, the term 'Pakistan' was an acrostic in which the letter 'k' stands for 'Kashmir'. Pakistanis therefore wanted, and expected, that the Muslim-majority princely state of J&K, of which Kashmir was its most captivating part, would join Pakistan. Conversely, evidence suggests that some Indian politicians had started to seriously consider J&K's future as early as August 1946.¹² Jawaharlal Nehru, whose forebears were ethnic Kashmiris from the Kashmir Valley, particularly wanted to secure the princely state for India. The main driving force for Nehru was his almost irrational attraction to Kashmir. The prestige of possessing Kashmir—or, for India, of denying this region to Pakistan—provides one of the main reasons for the instigation and continuation of the dispute between India and Pakistan over J&K.

In 1947, the other regions of J&K were not as well known as Kashmir. Jammu and other non-Kashmiri areas of J&K, except possibly Ladakh, had never enjoyed the geo-political unity, regional existence or continuous rule that Kashmiris had experienced for long periods. Rather, these non-Kashmiri areas usually comprised a mix of local principalities or fiefdoms in which rulers and their boundaries would change intermittently as a result of power struggles between internal and/or external forces. Consequently, given Kashmir's long-term existence as an entity and its fame, all four J&K Maharajas, who actually hailed geographically from Jammu, were happy with their peers or with British officials simply calling them and their princely state 'Kashmir', or the 'Kashmir *darbar*' (state or administration), not 'Jammu'.¹³ It is much harder to find information about these 'lesser' regions of J&K. None enjoyed Kashmir's geographic, historical and cultural continuity, nor its endearing and enduring fame. Conversely, the Kashmir region has long dominated the geographic area that comprises the 'crown' of the northern parts of the Indian subcontinent, and it continues to do so. Similarly, most newspapers covering J&K have predominantly reported events in the Kashmir Valley, not about the state itself, nor about the other four regions that exist in disputed and divided J&K. Kashmir's acclaim is why J&K was popularly called 'Kashmir'. Similarly, this also is why the post-1947 contest over Jammu and Kashmir is called 'the Kashmir dispute'.

Nevertheless, J&K's other regions may have historical antecedents and populations as old as those of Kashmir, plus some limited, and lesser known, aspects of fame. Buddhist Ladakh, for example, had been a separate kingdom under a *gyalpo* (king) until it sought Mughal assistance in the late seventeenth century to defeat invading Skopa Mongols from Central Asia. For this assistance, Ladakh paid tribute to the Mughals, and then to post-Mughal rulers in neighbouring Kashmir. In 1842, Raja Gulab Singh ended some 800 years of *gyalpo* rule and imposed a governor on this region. Both Ladakh and neighbouring Baltistan, which is located to Ladakh's north and whose people share a

similar ethnicity and language to Ladakhis, had strong connections with Tibet. Indeed, Ladakh ('land of high or many passes'), which is located immediately west of Tibet, is sometimes called 'Little Tibet' due to its Buddhist population. Before 1947, Baltistan also was called 'Little Tibet'. To the north and west of Baltistan, Gilgit is famous for the game of polo, a more regulated form of which spread southwards to the Indian subcontinent after a British official witnessed a robust contest in the Hunza Valley, north of Gilgit, in 1892. Each July, teams from Gilgit and Chitral, to Gilgit's west, play a polo match at the high plateau of Shandur (3,700 metres/12,200 feet above sea level), where a pass between both towns makes the plateau accessible in warmer months. This annual contest started in 1936, although the origins of polo are significantly older.

Ladakh, Baltistan and Gilgit also were all located on ancient and important trade routes that went from Central Asia to Punjab. This included the famous two thousand-year-old pilgrim and trade route that became known in the nineteenth century as the 'Silk Route'. This 'route' was a network of remote, often rugged, roads or tracks along which trading caravans vulnerable to robbery carried goods, and along which travelled religious and other ideas. It ran from Xian, at the Chinese end, via Central Asia, the Indian subcontinent and greater Persia/ Iran, as far as the Mediterranean, at the other end, and vice versa.¹⁴ In the subcontinent, a spur ran from Taxila (located a short distance west of modern Islamabad) to Kashgar (now Kashi), in Chinese-administered (eastern) Turkestan (or Turkistan; the 'Land of the Turks'). Another route went from Taxila, via the Khyber Pass, Balkh (in northern Afghanistan) and the Wakhan Corridor (north of modern J&K), to Kashgar. In Mughal times, Muslim pilgrims started using this route to travel to Mecca, with the Muslim ruler of Kashgar passing through Kashmir in 1667–68. In British times, trade along it involved opium, fabric, spices and hardware to China, and hashish, tea, silk, carpets, gold and silver from China.

The other two 'lesser' regions of J&K—Jammu and, since 1947, Azad Kashmir—were historically, geographically, culturally, ethnically and economically tied to, and heavily integrated with, Punjab and north-western parts of the Indian subcontinent. Indeed, to all intents and purposes, before the creation of J&K in 1846, the greater Jammu region, which included the Poonch Jagir in its west, much of which jagir eventually became Azad Kashmir in 1947, essentially was an extension of greater Punjab. After 1846, Jammu's and Poonch's links were mostly with Punjab and with each other, particularly as the Raja of Poonch was under the suzerainty of his relative, the Maharaja of J&K. There were links with upland Kashmir, even though its people were ethnically, linguistically and religiously different and more difficult to access than Punjab. By 1947, J&K comprised three provinces: Jammu Province, in the south of the princely state; Kashmir Province, which was roughly at J&K's centre; and the huge Frontier Districts Province, throughout the north and east of J&K. Even though J&K's princely rulers were ethnic Dogras from Jammu and it was these Dogras, with British support, who established and controlled the modern political entity of J&K, the Jammu area was always far less famous than, and of lesser significance than, Kashmir. These Jammuites basked in Kashmir's reputation and glory, which, in turn, added to theirs.

While Kashmir was always the highest profile of the areas and regions fused together during British times to create the princely state of Jammu and Kashmir, Kashmiris did not live in a vacuum. Necessarily, Kashmir had links with the other regions, if only because people seeking to enter, exit or capture Kashmir had to travel through areas adjacent to the Kashmir Valley to reach this desired region. The major routes into the Kashmir Valley were:

- from the upper Chenab Valley in Jammu in the south, via Banihal Pass;
- from Rajauri in the south-west, which was close to Punjab, via Pir Panjal Pass, which route was

called the Mughal Road as it was popular with Mughal overlords;

- from Poonch in the west, and Punjab beyond, via the Tosamaidan Pass;
- from Muzaffarabad in the west, beyond which was Punjab and NWFP, via Uri and the narrow Jhelum Valley Road that largely followed the Jhelum River;
- from Ladakh in the east, via Zoji La (pass), with Tibet and China far beyond Ladakh to the east;
- from Gilgit in the north, via the Burzil Pass, which route the British significantly improved in the early 1890s after obtaining, then ensuring, control of the Gilgit Agency in the 1880s.

All of these passes were subject to heavy snowfalls and blockages. Zoji La was ‘notorious for its freak weather’.¹⁵ The Burzil Pass route was closed by snow for around six months each year.

Along these various routes, Kashmiris and people in other areas engaged in long-established trade, employment and cultural exchanges. Similarly, at times Kashmir ruled some of these adjoining regions, while Kashmiri and neighbouring rulers often engaged in strategic marriages of their sons and daughters. Rajauri and Bhimber, in the Jammu area, and Ladakh, all paid tribute to Kashmir on occasions. Conversely, some of the fiercest threats to Kashmiris’ security were located nearby in Kishtwar, to Kashmir’s south-east, and in the Poonch and Muzaffarabad areas. The Kashmiris’ ‘traditional enemies’ were the hostile and aggressive Khahka and Bomba tribes who lived in these latter two areas. Ironically, these tribes were finally subjugated by the first ruler of J&K, Maharaja Gulab Singh, who was not a Kashmiri.¹⁶ Other non-Kashmiris sought to rule Kashmir, although not very successfully until the Mughals captured Kashmir in the late 1500s and incorporated this region into its subcontinental empire.

The etymology of the name ‘Kashmir’ is uncertain. It may come from a Kashmiri or Sanskrit term that means ‘to dry up water’, which relates to Kashmir possibly once having been under water. The Kashmir Valley may have been a giant lake or inland sea that, as a result of an act of nature, inadvertently drained and flooded areas downstream. These possibly included the highly advanced civilisation of riverine Mohenjo-Daro (located in what is now northern Sindh, Pakistan) that existed around 2600–1800 BC and the demise of which archaeologists have found difficult to explain. Equally, the term ‘Kashmir’ may derive from the name of an ancient *Rishi*, Kashyapa, with interpretations being ‘Kashyapa Mir (the lake of the sage Kashyapa) or Kashyapa Meru (Kashyapa’s Mount Meru)’, an important mountain in Hindu, Jain and Buddhist cosmology that was considered the centre of the physical and spiritual universes.¹⁷ The ancient Greeks, who knew of this region, called it ‘Kasperia’. In recent times, Kashmiris have called their locale ‘Rishi Vaer’, the ‘land of the Rishis’, or simply ‘Kashir’. This latter name is reflected in the title ‘Doordarshan Kashir’, the local branch of the Indian national television broadcaster Doordarshan, which broadcasts from Srinagar. Having ‘Kashir’ in its title presumably reflects and/ or enhances its local appeal.

Kashmir has been a settled and significant entity since ancient times. One of India’s oldest calendars, the *Saptarishi Samvat*, is from Kashmir. It dates back to 3076 BC.¹⁸ With the exception of some aboriginal Nisadas or Nagas, Pishachas and Shvapakas, whom Kashmiris assimilated, Kashmiris’ ancestors almost certainly were from Aryan stock, possibly from the Dardic subdivision of this group. This Kashmiri lineage is not certain, however, as the term ‘Dard’ may be derived from an older term ‘*Daradae*’, which apparently was used ‘to differentiate the Caucasian peoples of the Western Himalayas from their Indian (Kashmiri) and Mongol (Tibetan) neighbours’.¹⁹ It also may be a convenient invention, given that there was no actual Dard race or country.²⁰ Nevertheless, the British employed the term ‘Dard’ to describe people who lived in ‘Dardistan’, a region supposedly

located south of the Hindu Kush and north of the Indus River. This region included areas, or *illaqas*, that eventually became part of J&K's Frontier Districts Province: Astor (Astore), Bunji, Chilas, Gilgit, Hunza, Nagar, Punial and Yasin, plus areas further west, including nearby Chitral, and northern parts of Swat and Kohistan. Similarly, some historians claim that the Kashmiri language, which Kashmiris (or 'Kashuri') call 'Koshur', 'Kashur' or 'Kaeshur', is a Dardic language, albeit influenced by vocabulary from Indian languages, particularly Sanskrit. Others claim that Kashmiri developed from the ancient Prakrit language, which was important in northern India.²¹ While possibly so, Kashmiri apparently shares few similarities with nearby languages such as Punjabi or Pukhtoon.

Regardless of their origins, Kashmiris come from an old society. In a book completed around 1150 AD, a Kashmiri Brahmin writer, Kalhana, was able to trace a line of Kashmiri rulers back to at least 1182 BC.²² Apart from ancient Greeks, informed Chinese knew about the region, as did Romans, Jews, Tibetans and people in the ancient and advanced city of Taxila. Indeed, Greeks, probably from Bactria (Balkh in modern Afghanistan), may have ruled parts of Kashmir around the first century BC. A small number of Kashmiri kings, at times, paid tribute to China, or had feudatory relations with it. Conversely, on occasions, expansive Kashmiri kings ruled other areas of the subcontinent, including Taxila. Certainly, Kashmiris ruled nearby parts of Punjab on occasions, especially the routes between Kashmir and this fertile region, including via Rajauri, then considered part of greater Punjab but now in the western area of the Jammu region. The largest Kashmiri empire was under Lalitaditya-Muktapida, of the Karkota dynasty, in the 700s. A great and enlightened warrior called 'the most conspicuous figure in Kashmir history', he supposedly 'raised his country to a pitch of glory it had never before reached'.²³ Lalitaditya's large empire stretched into Central Asia, Tibet, Punjab and Gujarat, and possibly as far south as the Deccan Plateau. Concurrently, Kashmiris engaged in trade with a number of distant locations, including Bengal, the south-eastern Coromandel Coast of the Indian peninsula, Central Asia, Persia/ Iran, China, and with (relatively close) Ladakh and Tibet. Lalitaditya may have constructed the Martand Temple to Vishnu/ Surya located near Anantnag in southern Kashmir, which is now ruined but which some considered to be an architectural masterpiece. The most powerful Kashmiri Muslim ruler, Sultan Shihab-ud-Din, who ruled Kashmir from 1354 to 1373, also had a large empire. It included parts of Turkestan and what now comprises Sindh, Punjab, eastern Afghanistan, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, northern Balochistan and J&K.

At other times, the Kashmir kingdom was restricted to the Kashmir Valley, with isolation being an important factor that helped the development of a unique Kashmiri personality and culture. Apart from being located a long way by horse or foot from the populous Punjab plains to its south, the Kashmir Valley was difficult to access because entry and exit to it were controlled via some twenty-six strategic passes situated in the surrounding mountains (five of which were mentioned above). Such isolation for Kashmiris was often enforced, with an Indian observer associated with an early visit to J&K by officials from the East India Company in 1846 noting that Kashmiris were 'kept in a kind of involuntary prison, none being allowed to go to or from without a passport from the [local] authorities'.²⁴ Kashmir's isolation helped with the region's defence, as did its bitterly cold winter weather and associated snowfalls. Kashmiris traditionally divide their seventy-day winter that starts on 21 December into three distinct periods: *chillai kalan*, the period of extreme cold of forty days; *chillai khurd*, the 'small cold' of twenty days; and *chillai baccha*, the 'baby cold' of ten days. During this time, the Kashmir Valley is difficult to penetrate physically due to harsh, cold and inclement weather and large amounts of snow, ice and slush. Today, both air and road travel are often interrupted by the effects of snow, ice and inclement weather during periods of cold, as I can testify.

Most Indians and Pakistanis to the south neither experience nor understand such extreme or difficult conditions.

To travel to Kashmir remained difficult until the 1880s, when the British and the Dogras started to develop or improve important transport and communication links to the princely state from both central Punjab and its north-western Frontier Districts. These changes were made to enhance trade, increase tourism or for military reasons, chiefly to move troops and associated materiel to the Kashmir Valley and locations beyond, particularly to the strategic Ladakh and Gilgit areas. By 1890, the Jhelum Valley Road from Rawalpindi to Srinagar via the popular British hill station of Murree, then via Muzaffarabad, had become a major route for wheeled traffic. Importantly, this was an 'all-weather road' not effected by snow, inclement weather and landslides to anywhere near the extent of other roads into Kashmir. Blockages could be cleared in hours or days, not weeks or months. Similarly, the route from Jammu via the Banihal Pass was upgraded exclusively for the Maharaja's wheeled traffic by 1915, and for general use by 1922. By then, Jammu town had been connected by rail to nearby Sialkot, Punjab, for thirty-two years. Trains from Sialkot travelled south-west to Wazirabad, where they connected with the major North Western Railway from Lahore to Peshawar, and with the greater Indian rail network. In 1891, there was talk of building a railway line to Srinagar from India, a difficult proposition given the heights and varieties of terrain involved. This railway finally, but only partially, 'arrived' in 2009, when Baramulla was connected, via Srinagar, with Qazigund, at the southern end of the Kashmir Valley. (The missing Qazigund to Katra section of 200 km in the Jammu part of Indian J&K, which goes through difficult terrain that is regularly subject to landslides, is yet to be completed. The Katra Qazigund section is due to be completed in 2017–18. The more southerly Udhampur to Katra section was completed in 2014.)

Despite the difficulties of physically penetrating Kashmir, the region appears to have always had strong links with northern parts of the subcontinent. Kashmiris would travel to such locations for trade, work and other activities, and during times of trouble in their valley, such as when there were devastating famines or oppressive rulers. This travel and trade was conducted by foot, with Kashmiris having the reputation of being 'good pedestrians', or by horse and pony, or by human-carried litter. Conversely, grain from Punjab was transported into Kashmir on occasions to alleviate famines. Much internal trade within Kashmir was undertaken using boat transport along expansive waterways, in particular using the Jhelum River that flows through the middle of the Kashmir Valley. Another form of transport was a type of enforced and backbreaking (literally) labour called *begaar* that rulers compelled only J&K Muslims to undertake and which finally was abolished in 1920.²⁵ Wheeled carriages only began to replace pedestrian forms of transport in J&K from the last quarter of the nineteenth century. This development was patchy, with no wheeled transport being used in Gilgit or Ladakh as recently as 1941.²⁶ By the late 1890s, telegraph lines connected most major centres in J&K, and J&K with India, as a result of which English became an important language locally. From 1881, an English-medium school, the Kashmir Mission School, began operating in Srinagar. Thus, although Kashmir had been historically isolated at times, Kashmiris rarely lived in a complete cultural, religious, economic or political vacuum.

While Kashmir was relatively remote, it may have been home to some significant religious figures from 'outside'. Some Kashmiris claim that Musa (Moses) is buried in the Vale and that this region is home to one of the lost tribes of Israel. In Srinagar, there is a shrine to Hazrat Yousaf Asif that some purport is the burial place of Jesus, who locally was also called Issa.²⁷ Located in suburban Rozabal, Hazrat Yousaf Asif shares his shrine with Syed Naseer-Ud-Din, who supposedly lived in the area

some centuries ago.²⁸ Issa was apparently revered locally for his wisdom and sanctity. People who claim to be his descendants maintain the shrine. Post-crucifixion, the story goes, a very much alive Jesus/Issa returned to Kashmir where he had previously lived and studied, including in a Buddhist monastery at Hemis in adjacent Ladakh.²⁹ His mother, Mary, apparently travelled with him. Mary only got as far as Murree, in upland Punjab, however, where she supposedly is buried. Indeed, the word 'Murree' is possibly a derivation of Mary. Thomas the Apostle may also have travelled with Jesus and Mary. There is strong evidence that he preached in the Aramaic language in south India. He is supposedly buried at St. Thomas Mount, Chennai (formerly Madras), where he allegedly was martyred. Interestingly, Kalhana in his *Rajatarangini* (River of Kings) provides details about a 'priest-king' called Samdhimati Aryaraja. Reputedly, this 'greatest of sages' lived from 34 BC-17 AD, which was contemporaneous with Jesus/Issa and with whom Samdhimati shares a similar life story. This includes being executed and revived miraculously, after which Samdhimati ruled Kashmir for forty-seven years until he abdicated and became a recluse.³⁰

In terms of religion, the Kashmir region was once a major and important centre for both Hinduism and Buddhism. The latter set of beliefs was prevalent, and ascendant, in Kashmir from around the third century BC to the fourth century AD. The revered *Lotus Sutra* was apparently 'set down' in Kashmir in the first century AD, with a Chinese translation of this document being made by Kumarajiva, a Buddhist scholar-monk who trained in Kashmir in the late fourth century AD. Buddhism was certainly important in the second century AD when a major 'world' Buddhist conference convened by the great Kushan ruler, Kanishka, was held in the Kashmir Valley. Under the leadership of an advanced monk named Nagarjuna, Kashmiris also supposedly cemented the ideas, ideals and practices of Mahayana Buddhism, or 'The Great Vehicle', a term that first appears in the *Lotus Sutra*.³¹ Mahayana Buddhism encourages a soul to become enlightened, or a *bodhisattva*, after which 'it' should strive to help other souls to achieve *nirvana*, or liberation for the soul from the suffering of enduring ongoing cycles of birth and rebirth. The Mahayana set of beliefs was exported via missionaries to China, Central Asia, Tibet, and beyond. Many of these missionaries initially may have been Kashmiris.

For a variety of reasons, Buddhism waned in Kashmir as 'Brahmanism', or orthodox Hinduism, reasserted itself throughout the subcontinent and surrounds, including in Kashmir, around the fifth century AD. Before Buddhism, Kashmiris engaged in a range of Aryan-inspired religious practices which arose from *Sanatana Dharma* (the eternal law or way) and which practices now might be labelled 'Vedic' or 'Hindu'. Post-Buddhism, Kashmir was the home of Kashmiri Shaivism (or Trika-Shasana, Trika-Shastra, Trika), a set of monistic beliefs based on merging oneself in Shiva (or universal consciousness), the god of choice of many Kashmiri Hindus.³² Kashmir produced some famous masters and scholars of this Hindu philosophy, including Abhinavagupta, who lived around the eleventh century. Considered to be 'the final authority on all aspects of Shaivism',³³ Abhinavagupta wrote an innovative recension of the very popular Vaishnava *Bhagavad Gita* from a Kashmiri Shaivite point of view. The beliefs and practices of Kashmiri Shaivism and Mahayana Buddhism possibly prepared the way for the later, and popular, introduction of monotheistic Islam in Kashmir.

The arrival of Islam added to Kashmir's rich religious past and complexity. Sufi-infused Sunni Islam slowly seeped into the compact Kashmir Valley starting perhaps from the late 1000s, and certainly from the 1200s. It came via travellers, traders, mercenaries, missionaries and returning Kashmiris. From the early 1300s, Islam was brought more actively into Kashmir by 'selfless

divines', such as Bulbul Shah, from Turkestan via Baghdad, and more particularly by Shah Hamadan from Hamadan, Iran. Both men possibly came to Kashmir to avoid the devastation of their areas by Timur/Tamerlane (ruled 1370–1405) and other Central Asian Mongol or Turkic marauders. The examples of such Sufis inspired Kashmiris, and created converts. From the 1490s, by which time Islam had become the religion of the majority of Kashmiris, Shia Muslims arrived in Kashmir and made some converts, both in the Kashmir Valley and in northern parts of what now comprises J&K. The slow, but steady, infiltration of Muslims and Islamic beliefs resulted in almost all Kashmiris, except high caste Hindu Brahmins known as Pandits or Bhattas (a learned person), adopting Islam as their religion. The first Muslim ruler of Kashmir was Rinchin (ruled 1320–23). Bulbul Shah converted this prince who was originally from Ladakh to Islam at a time when most Kashmiris were either Hindus or Buddhists. The first lifelong Muslim to rule Kashmir was Shah Mir, originally from Swat, who ruled as Sultan Shams-ud-Din. He ruled Kashmir from 1339–42, by which time many Kashmiris had adopted, or were adopting, Islam as their religion. Indeed, his enthronement entrenched Islam as the major religion of Kashmiris. Shah Mir also founded the Sultan dynasty that ruled Kashmir for 222 years. Thereafter, other Muslims, comprising Mughals or Afghans, ruled Kashmir until 1819, when Sikhs captured the region. Sikhs ruled Kashmir until 1846.³⁴

While Islam ultimately became the predominant religion in Kashmir, this region has always been a spiritual place whose residents generally appear to have tolerated a range of different religious beliefs and practices. Kashmir has a long, local mystical *Rishi* tradition, with *Rishi* mystics, saints and sages using the local Kashmiri language to reveal their ideas and to preach, not the court languages of Sanskrit or, later, Persian. Kashmir's patron saint, Nur-ud-Din, the 'Light of the Faith', also known as Sheikh Nur-ud-Din Wali or simply as Nund Rishi, was a *Rishi*. He lived around the fourteenth century and was an early Hindu convert to Islam. He also was associated with a famous female Kashmiri Shaivite mystic and poet, Lal Ded or Lalleshwari, who may have met Shah Hamadan. Like Lal Ded, Nund Rishi preached equality and tolerance and apparently was revered equally by Hindus and Muslims. As a result of the *Rishi* tradition, Kashmiris reputedly have long practised a form of tolerance and inclusivity called 'Kashmiriness' whereby they respect each other's religious traditions, celebrate each other's religious festivals, and eat fish and lamb but not beef and pork, which respectively are unacceptable to Hindus and Muslims. Around 1988, this practice was re-named 'Kashmiriyat', a term that owes its roots to Persian and Arabic.

The practice of Kashmiriness/Kashmiriyat has been somewhat romanticised. For example, Bamzai states that, while the Muslims and Hindus in Kashmir 'had developed a tolerant and peaceful outlook on religious belief', they had 'lived in perfect harmony throughout the course of their chequered history'.³⁵ Incongruously, 'Kashmiriness' did not deter rivalry and antipathy between Hindu Pandits, who were influential in government for long periods, and Muslim artisans and peasants, who invariably were poorer, illiterate and often exploited by Pandit officials. Similarly, Sunni and Shia Kashmiris had troubles at times, with their differences offering the third Mughal emperor, Akbar (ruled 1556–1605), a pretext to invade Kashmir, and capture it, in 1586. Recently, the concept of Kashmiriness has suffered a setback, with many of Kashmir's Hindu Pandits having fled the Kashmir Valley soon after Muslim Kashmiris began their anti-India uprising in 1988. Feeling intimidated, many Pandits went to Jammu, New Delhi or to other parts of India. According to one source, only 808 of 57,000 Pandit families did not leave Kashmir around 1990.³⁶ Despite this, some Kashmiri Muslims feel that Kashmir is incomplete without its Hindu minority and they want the Pandits to return. Some Pandits have returned; many have not.

The most recent exodus of Kashmiris continues a trend begun long ago of people leaving the

Kashmir Valley for safer climes or better opportunities elsewhere. Some of these ‘old Kashmiris’ have become famous and, in turn, have enhanced the fame of Kashmir. More recent examples include the first Prime Minister of independent India, ‘Pandit’ Jawaharlal Nehru (and his descendants and former Indian prime ministers, Indira Gandhi and Rajiv Gandhi), and the famous subcontinental poet, scholar and philosopher, Muhammad Iqbal. Nehru was a Hindu by birth and secular by nature; Iqbal was a strong follower of Islam. Enchanted by Kashmir and ‘under its spell’, Nehru arguably was the highest profile publicist for this region and its people in the twentieth century.³⁷ He was keen for J&K to join India in 1947. Conversely, his contemporary, Iqbal, was an early and strong proponent of Pakistan and of Kashmir becoming part of this nation for Muslims. While these two men knew each other and although they shared a Kashmiri heritage, Kashmiriness/Kashmiriyat did not guarantee that they could agree politically. Kashmiris’ beliefs and practices have never been monolithic.

Kashmir was also famous because of its arts and crafts, for culinary reasons and because of some famous shrines. Some of the Kashmiris’ significant arts and crafts skills, such as sophisticated weaving and carpet making, were introduced to Kashmir, especially from Iran and Samarkand, Tamerlane’s former capital and a place that Babur, before he established the Mughal dynasty in northern India, won and lost three times. These importations led to a major reason why Kashmir was famous: for the beauty of its shawls. From pre-Mughal times to around the 1870s, Kashmir produced and exported large numbers of high quality shawls, particularly to France. Indeed, in the early 1800s, these ‘universal symbol[s] of aristocracy across the Indo-Persian world’ were both highly desirable and world famous, especially in Europe.³⁸ This market was curtailed by France’s defeat in the Franco-Prussian War of 1870–71, although shawl production and trading in shawls continued in Kashmir as viable industries. Kashmir has also acquired fame for culinary reasons. Its high-grade saffron, possibly exported from as far back as 500 BC, was used for cuisine and medicinal purposes throughout the subcontinent and as far away as Greece. Kashmiri cuisine itself was well known, especially for a complex set of 36 different exotic and elegant dishes that collectively was called *wazwan*. Finally, Kashmir was famous because of some important pilgrimage places and shrines visited by people of all religions. Hazratbal Shrine in Srinagar has a revered sacred relic reputed to be a hair of the Prophet Muhammad that a Kashmiri businessman purchased in the late 1600s. The Pir Dastgir shrine in Srinagar housed relics that included a hair of the *pir*’s (saint’s) beard and manuscripts reputedly written by Caliph Abu Bakr, the first Muslim caliph (spiritual leader) after Prophet Muhammad’s death, and by Ali, Prophet Muhammad’s son-in-law. An Afghan Governor of Kashmir Province reputedly brought these manuscripts to Kashmir some 300 years ago.³⁹ An important third shrine made from timber was to Sheikh Nur-ud-Din Wali, Kashmir’s patron saint, at Charar-e-Sharif, 30 km west of Srinagar and now in Badgam District. Unfortunately, fire destroyed Charar-e-Sharif in 1995 and the Pir Dastgir shrine in 2012, much to the disappointment or anger of many Kashmiris, regardless of their religion.

Due to its beauty and fame, Kashmir had long drawn people to it. Indeed, for a considerable period of time, outsiders have considered the Kashmir Valley to be one of the most beautiful regions in the subcontinent, perhaps even the world, a veritable ‘Eden of the East’.⁴⁰ These outsiders included members of the famous Mughal dynasty, whose love of Kashmir added to the region’s fame. (Conversely, Kashmiris have not necessarily been influenced in the same way by their region’s beauty, with many either taking it for granted or simply struggling to survive a difficult winter climate and/ or difficult times.) Kashmir had sparkling lakes, such as Dal Lake in Srinagar and India’s largest freshwater lake, Wular Lake, near Sopore. The broad Jhelum River ran through it. Other interesting

waterways were populated by moveable houseboats for tourists' use, particularly in and around Srinagar, Kashmir's traditional capital. These houseboats took great advantage of Kashmir's natural abundance of water and timber. Srinagar itself was known as the 'Venice of the East'.⁴¹ Located further north than Lhasa, Tibet, and allegedly founded by Emperor Ashoka, this major subcontinental city was possibly 'the second oldest city after Varanasi in South Asia'.⁴² The Kashmir Valley itself was surrounded by majestic, snow-clad peaks and high hills that were popular with tourists wanting to hike, hunt or fish. Within the valley, productive farmland and orchards were framed by large trees or forests, such as the grand *chinar* (or oriental plane tree), by numerous rows of poplars and poplar-lined roads, and by Mughal-built manicured pleasure gardens, such as the acclaimed Shalimar Bagh and Nishat Bagh—*bagh* in Persian means garden—both of which were located near the shores of Srinagar's famous Dal Lake. These factors all enhanced Kashmir's natural beauty. A further, and important, attraction was the Kashmir Valley's climate. Although still hot in summer, it was considerably cooler than the stifling heat that the subcontinental plains further south endured during sweltering summer months. The reverse, however, applied in winter, when the Kashmir Valley was extremely cold, snowbound and inaccessible. Kashmiris 'enjoyed' a very bracing climate.

With Kashmir generally isolated and difficult to access, the region was often not integrated politically into the subcontinent. This changed in 1586, when Akbar finally captured Kashmir and dissolved its Sultan dynasty. Akbar had to confront Kashmiris well known for their fighting prowess. In the 700s, Kashmiri soldiers created Lalitaditya's empire. In the 1000s, they enhanced their military reputations by twice preventing the brutal Mahmud of Ghazni and his aggressive, all-conquering forces from invading Kashmir via Tosamaidan Pass. Equally, whenever Kashmir was invaded, Kashmiris united and fought the intruder. Tough and capable fighters defended the entrances to the Kashmir Valley in strategically located forts; they utilised natural defences, such as forests, in which to fight; they employed difficult-to-defeat guerrilla warfare tactics. Invading forces, despite often enjoying superior numbers and/ or equipment, found it difficult to defeat their Kashmiri enemies.⁴³ For a long time, Kashmiris also resisted Mughal rule. The first Mughal emperor, Babar, who had apparently coveted Kashmir even before he won the Delhi throne in 1526, first attempted to capture Kashmir around 1527. Although unsuccessful, Babar was attracted by the region's fame, potential revenue and appealing cooler climate, which was similar to his homeland. Babar's grandson, Akbar, who became emperor of the then weak Mughal Empire as a thirteen-year old in 1556, also sought to obtain Kashmir. In 1568, Akbar tried unsuccessfully using diplomatic efforts to secure suzerainty over the local Chak rulers, who had ruled Kashmir since 1561. Thereafter, other conquests engaged the Mughal. By 1586, however, Akbar and his empire had become strong while Kashmir's situation was deteriorating due to significant Sunni-Shia sectarianism that the Chaks, who were Shias, allegedly often instigated. Consequently, some disenchanted Sunnis invited their fellow Sunni, Akbar, to rule Kashmir. With the internal support of anti-Chak dissidents, Akbar's military forces prevailed. It had taken the Mughals almost sixty years to capture Kashmir.

Akbar's victory ended Kashmir's existence as a separate kingdom. Thereafter, Kashmir became a *subah* (province) of the Mughal Empire, as later would Baltistan and Ladakh when people in these remote places sought Mughal help to resist Tibetan domination. (The various small kingdoms in the Jammu area were already under Mughal control.) Concurrently, Akbar disbanded the local Kashmiri military forces that comprised a standing army based in Srinagar, plus provincial troops, feudal levies and volunteers. The finally victorious Mughals also allegedly sought to diminish the Kashmiris' martial instincts and skills by compelling all Kashmiri men to wear an article of apparel called a *pheran*. This loose-fitting long gown, which may have existed before the Mughals, was

considered ‘effeminate’ by some non-Kashmiris.⁴⁴ It certainly severely restricted Kashmiri men’s ability to engage in combat because it hindered unfettered movement, including preventing the easy and rapid drawing of knives or swords from their scabbards. This apparel-led pacification of Kashmiris seemingly worked as many outsiders came to consider Kashmiris ‘cowardly’⁴⁵ and a ‘non-martial race’. Equally, the Mughals’ love for Kashmir and their reasonable treatment possibly placated Kashmiris. Arguably, the Kashmiris’ seeming passivity emboldened external rulers to suppress their Kashmiri subjects with a degree of alacrity, although internal rebellions did occur on occasions. Certainly, their non-martial status deemed Kashmiris unsuitable to serve in the British Indian or J&K armies.

The Mughals significantly added to Kashmir’s already famous reputation. Akbar visited the region three times, suggesting on one visit the creation of a forerunner to the modern houseboat for tourists. His son and heir, Jahangir (ruled 1605–27), who added the neighbouring Kashmiri-speaking kingdom of Kishtwar to the Mughal Empire, was an obvious enthusiast for Kashmir. Jahangir visited the region eight times, twice with his father and six times on his own. Given the difficult roads and the vagaries of transport in the 1600s, this was a major effort. It was Jahangir particularly who heightened Kashmir’s fame. He did so not only by frequenting the region, but also by building exotic formal gardens and, more pointedly, by calling Kashmir ‘paradise on earth’. Allegedly, when asked on his deathbed if he had any final desire, Jahangir wistfully sighed: ‘Only Kashmir’. He died returning to Lahore from Kashmir, where he had attempted to improve his failing health. Jahangir’s son, Shah Jahan (ruled 1628–58), also built gardens in the Vale. Jahangir’s grandson, the Sufi-inspired and religiously eclectic, Dara Shikoh, whom Aurangzeb defeated for the Mughal throne, spent much time in the Kashmir Valley. Reputedly, Dara built a palace, mosque, observatory and a college of Sufism in Srinagar. These Mughals’ love for, and involvement with, Kashmir further enhanced the region’s appeal and reputation.⁴⁶

Generally, post-Mughal rulers did not have the same emotional love for Kashmir as their Mughal predecessors. Indeed, many often saw the Kashmir Valley as a financial resource to be heavily exploited. Some time after 1846, Srinagar became the summer capital for the Jammu-based Dogra rulers of J&K. (In winter, they stayed home in Jammu.) Certainly, in 1856, the elderly Maharaja Gulab Singh was living full time in Srinagar as Governor of Kashmir, having relinquished the throne in favour of his son, Ranbir. Increasingly, Kashmir became a popular tourist destination. Britishers started visiting for non-military reasons soon after British-led forces finally pacified Punjab in 1849, with ‘some 300’ British being in Kashmir in 1891.⁴⁷ In 1940, 29,000 people (comprising 8,000 Europeans (mainly British) and 21,000 Indians visited Kashmir as tourists or holiday-makers. It then was known as the ‘Happy Valley’.⁴⁸ Again, given the vagaries of travelling to Kashmir, this was a significant number. It took ‘one day, during summer’ to travel to Kashmir’s capital and largest city, Srinagar. Visitors had the choice of three motorable roads: the all-weather Jhelum Valley Road, 196 miles from Rawalpindi, where there was a railway station; the shorter road from the Havelian rail terminus, 71 miles north of Rawalpindi in NWFP, via Abbottabad and Muzaffarabad; and, the ‘more picturesque’ 203-mile road from Jammu City to Srinagar via the Banihal Pass.⁴⁹ None of these routes allowed the rapid transport of large numbers of tourists. Visitors stayed in hotels and on houseboats, went fishing and hiked, and skied or camped in Kashmir’s hills and mountains. They also were subjected to various rules and restrictions.⁵⁰

More recently, tourism to Kashmir and religious tourism have been increasing in Indian J&K. In 2009, 450,000 Indian and 24,000 foreign tourists visited Kashmir, with many arriving by plane.

While significant, this was about half the number of visitors in the mid-1980s, before visitors were deterred by the anti-India uprising in the Kashmir Valley that began around 1988. By 2011, record numbers of tourists were again visiting Kashmir: more than one million domestic tourists and 32,000 foreign tourists.⁵¹ These numbers should only increase if Kashmir remains peaceful. There is also an increasing number of Hindus undertaking pilgrimages in J&K. In 2009, 400,000 pilgrims visited the reputedly ancient cave shrine dedicated to Lord Shiva at Amarnath. Overwhelmingly, these were Hindus supported by Muslim porters and others. This remote pilgrimage spot at an altitude of 3,900 metres is located 140 km from Srinagar near Pahalgam, at the head of the Lidder Valley. It has long been a pilgrimage place, being discussed in detail in a 1919 publication⁵² and mentioned in the 1941 Census of India as an annual event organised by the J&K Government.⁵³ Numbers have increased greatly over time, with some 635,000 pilgrims visiting Amarnath in 2011.⁵⁴ While significant, in 2009, 8.2 million (Hindu) pilgrims visited Mata Vaishnodevi and 800,000 (Hindu) pilgrims visited Shiv Khori, both of which are located in Jammu. These two shrines, which possibly date from the seventeenth century, are significantly easier to access than Amarnath. In 2009, 79,000 tourists, including 41,000 foreigners, visited Ladakh,⁵⁵ which was first opened to tourists in 1974. However, of Indian J&K's three regions, Kashmir is still the best known. In terms of tourism, it also is most popular by diversity of clientele, who generally don't visit for religious reasons alone, and by their length of stay, which is generally longer than a short religious pilgrimage.

While the term 'Jammu and Kashmir' was appropriate in 1846 when the princely state was constructed, in later years, this term did not reflect this entity's geographic composition. By 1889, a correct term would have been 'Jammu, Kashmir and the Frontier Districts' or 'Jammu, Kashmir and the Northern Frontier', which remote frontier bordered Afghanistan and China. Nevertheless, the term 'Jammu and Kashmir' did actually reflect the fact that the large bulk of the princely state's population resided in its two major provinces: Jammu Province, in southern J&K, and Kashmir Province, to its north. The large Frontier Districts Province that spread through north and east J&K was lightly populated. Yet, even though Jammu Province was J&K's most populous province, the princely state nevertheless was popularly called 'Kashmir'. In terms of prestige, the term 'Kashmir and Jammu' therefore would have been more accurate than 'Jammu and Kashmir'. Kashmir continues to be the part of J&K that India and Pakistan both desire most of all. Interestingly, some non-Kashmiri Muslim leaders in J&K defer to Kashmiris for political leadership and/or they want Srinagar to be capital of any re-constituted or independent J&K. Arguably, they do so because Kashmir is J&K's most prestigious, well known and significant region—a factor that self-confident and somewhat self-centred Kashmiris also believe.

The historical and strategic context for the British

Context is important. The British created the princely state of J&K, or 'Kashmir', in 1846 after they defeated the Sikhs. Although they could have ruled J&K directly themselves, the British decided to allow a local ruler from Jammu, Raja Gulab Singh, control of this entity. To understand this significant British insecurity, we need to discuss the greater historical and strategic context within which the princely state of J&K was located. Part of this discussion involves relating the rise to power in 'India' of the East India Company, the accompanying demise of Mughal and Persian power and influence and their replacement by more local forces, and continual British fears that their empire might be invaded by foreign armies, chiefly Russian via strategic passes in northern and north-western parts of their empire, including in J&K. We start, albeit briefly, with the East India Company,

whose rise to become the most powerful force in India was an extraordinary achievement.

The East India Company was a mercantile enterprise founded in London in 1600 by royal charter. Its rise in India started when some English traders arrived at Surat, in western India, around 1611. The rich and grand Mughal Empire under its fourth emperor, Jahangir, was then all-powerful in northern India and, arguably, was the most alluring political and economic entity in the world. From 1611, the fortunes of the East India Company, which was variously called 'John Company'/'Company Bahudur' (brave Company)/'EICo'/'the Honourable Company', rose steadily, and continually throughout the subcontinent. This rise roughly coincided with the demise and ultimate fragmentation of the Mughal Empire following the death in 1707 of its last, and somewhat divisive but expansionist, great emperor, Aurangzeb. Coincidentally, in 1707, Great Britain formally came into being when the Act of Union unified the parliaments of England and Scotland, in London. This Union started to challenge the might of France, then the most powerful nation in Europe. The East India Company's rise in the subcontinent was aided, abetted and protected by its combative and capable military arm, particularly under Robert Clive. This ultimately resulted in the formal 'rule' of the increasingly powerful East India Company beginning in north India in 1765 when a weak Mughal emperor, Shah Alam, enacted the Company as the administrator of his eastern provinces of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa (now Odisha). Importantly, this included the right to collect taxes. For a mercantile operation, this was a significant concession. As a result, it 'ceased to be a company of merchants and became a formidable political force'.⁵⁶

From 1765, through cunning, collaboration, commercialism, consolidation and some courageous victories against its competitors, including the French, the East India Company triumphed as the leading force in the Indian subcontinent. By 1804, following some significant military victories by Arthur Wellesley, the British had become the major force in this geographic entity. They made Calcutta (now Kolkata) their capital. It was an important city as the British expanded into Asia, Australasia and Africa by creating or consolidating colonies. The final episode of British expansion in India involved the capture of north-western areas that were part of the capable Sikh Empire. This involved cunning and courage more than collaboration and commercialism. In 1849, British military and political domination of India was completed when British forces won their second, and final, war against the Sikhs. Apart from some small Portuguese and French enclaves, one power now controlled the entire Indian subcontinent for the first time ever. The British Government, acting through its administrative and military agent, the East India Company, had unified 'India' and made it into a single political concern. 'A warehouse was expanded into a province; a province into an Empire.'⁵⁷

Nevertheless, the British could not, or would not, rest on their imperial laurels. Their economically attractive empire was not secure. Before the British first fought the Sikhs in 1846, the British Indian Army had crossed Sikh territory in 1839 and entered Afghanistan. Supposedly, this was to deter the advancing Russians, a threat in various ways and guises, including the later Soviet variation, that would fixate the British, often excessively, until 1947. Another major matter was how to placate unruly Afghanistan, which nation could act as a buffer state to separate the British and Russian empires but which an invading army also could use, or traverse through, to enter India. Pro-active British actions in Afghanistan related to the East India Company's so-called 'forward policy', by which it assertively sought to obtain or defend territory at the edge of its empire. Ostensibly, this policy had been devised to further trade and to increase profits. Equally, an increasingly powerful idea, and concern, was the protection of British borders by administrators and soldiers who understood 'the tenuousness of colonial power at the margins'.⁵⁸ This was particularly so in north-western India, even though the British Indian Empire had not, in 1839, established a direct border

with Afghanistan. This area, which was located a long way from Calcutta, nevertheless offered further opportunities for trade and expansion. Concurrently, Punjab was becoming increasingly volatile as the powerful Sikh Emperor, Ranjit Singh, physically wavered in the late 1830s. His death in June 1839 created opportunities for the British in north-western India. Concurrently, they became even more concerned about rival European powers expanding into, or invading, the British Indian Empire via this unsettled area.

To their ultimate detriment, the British knew very little about Afghanistan in 1839, including where its actual boundaries were located. One thing the British did know was that Afghanistan was strategically important because large armies traditionally had invaded the Indian subcontinent using passes located at the end of the Iranian plateau. (Apart from an Arab invasion of Sindh in the early 700s, only Europeans invaded India by sea.) These passes went from eastern Afghanistan directly into north-western India. There were two major invasion routes: the northerly route via Kabul and the 30-mile long Khyber Pass; the southerly route via Kandahar, Khojak Pass and the 80-mile long Bolan Pass. There were other routes, including a more northerly one closer to modern J&K that Alexander the Great may have used in 326 BC. Other high-profile invaders of the Indian subcontinent included Mahmud of Ghazni (some seventeen times between 998 and 1030), Tamerlane/ Timur (1398), and the first Mughal emperor, Babur (1526). Other interlopers included various Persians, Afghans, who sometimes were under Persian suzerainty, and disparate forces from western Turkestan/Central Asia. Conversely, the Mughals and other north Indian rulers, such as the Mauryans, used the Afghan passes to control territories to their west in Afghanistan and Central Asia. Beyond these passes and to Afghanistan's west—as the little-informed British then perceived things—lay some significant threats, particularly the Russians. Although the British didn't know it at the time, one Russian general had noted that, of some twenty-one attempted invasions of the Indian subcontinent via the north and west, eighteen had succeeded, a statistic that suggested that the Russians could do likewise.⁵⁹ Certainly, from around 1800, the British increasingly feared a Russian invasion of India, particularly as these fellow Europeans were moving significantly closer to British controlled areas of India.

Prior to their alarm about possible Russian expansion, southwards from European Russia, the British had been concerned about the French under the aggressive Napoleon. France sent a mission to Persia's new capital, Teheran, in 1796, while French forces assertively conquered Egypt two years later. The British became fearful that Napoleon had plans to invade India, possibly starting from Egypt. Such British fears had been fuelled by rumours that the Russian Tsar, Paul, had become disenchanted with the British and was planning a Franco-Russian invasion of India by 70,000 troops. Supposedly, this was scheduled for 1801, probably via Afghanistan. In 1801, Paul did order a force of 22,000 Cossacks, complete with artillery, to move from Orenburg, about 350 miles north of the Caspian Sea, via Khiva and Bukhara (Bokhara) in Central Asia, and invade India. They stopped just north of the Aral Sea, chiefly as Paul had been deposed and killed. This was not Russia's first venture into this area. In 1717, Peter the Great had tentatively sent a mission to Khiva and, in the early 1720s, to the difficult Caucasus area around the Caspian Sea of the (then) Persian Empire. Both efforts were unsuccessful. Indeed, the Khan of Khiva killed almost all of the 4,000 Russians dispatched by Peter the Great. In 1807, Tsar Paul's successor, Tsar Alexander, and Napoleon may have reignited discussion about Paul's invasion plan. However, both rulers fell out badly in 1812 when Napoleon disastrously attacked Moscow. In 1807, Napoleon also may have sent a mission to Persia suggesting that their combined forces invade India. This force was to travel via Afghanistan, not via the more difficult southern route along the desolate and difficult Makran Coast that had caused Alexander the Great's army major loss of life when it was leaving the subcontinent. This Franco-

Persian proposal lapsed, as did any French invasion of India after Napoleon's significant defeat at the Battle of Waterloo in 1815 by a soldier formerly stationed in India, Arthur Wellesley, the Duke of Wellington.

While a successful land invasion of India by any foreign force would have been difficult to achieve, even talk of it caused the British anxiety. An aggressive military expedition to India would have been exceedingly difficult to organise, coordinate, mount and sustain, if only because of the remote location of the potential theatre of war and the associated logistical difficulties of transporting, or marching, and re-supplying Russian, Persian and/ or French forces there. And, once an invading force had managed to negotiate the Afghan passes, it then had to cross the Indus River, another major natural obstacle. Furthermore, it was most likely that any invasion of India would be militarily opposed at sea by the powerful Royal Navy and on land by fresher British forces entrenched in positions of strength that would have been much easier to re-supply than those of any invading force. Nevertheless, Napoleon's demise did not eliminate British fears of India being invaded by land. Not only did the British fear having to fight a serious war in India and/ or losing territory and income, but also they feared the destabilising impact that an invasion, proposed or actual, might have on 'their' Indian citizenry who they were then controlling or suppressing, depending on your point of view. Conversely, potential invaders hoped, and the British feared, that disenchanted Indians would act as sympathisers or 'fifth columnists' to assist anti-British invaders by providing intelligence or by creating local instability.

Nothing came of the French, Franco-Russian and Franco-Persian invasion plans. Nevertheless, this did not stem British fears about an expansive Russia, which had started its expansion in the early 1700s during Peter the Great's empowering rule. Increasingly, some British believed that Britain must counter the alliteratively easy but strategically challenging 'Muscovite menace', even though Peter had actually moved Russia's capital to St Petersburg, 650 km north-west of Moscow, in 1713. This 'menace', which supposedly was desirous of obtaining India, came to dominate the thinking of some British strategists, a factor not always beneficial to British or Indian soldiers ordered to implement Britain's difficult anti-Russian strategies. Talk of a Russian invasion was 'the grand military topic of conversation in India', with British travellers who had visited countries between India and Russia all agreeing about 'the possibility of Russian invasion'. The question was whether 'to go and fight' the Russians well before they got to India or 'to wait and fight' them in India.⁶⁰ This strategic conundrum became the most important defensive concern for the British Empire in India. It would lead to all sorts of decisions, diplomatic issues and (mis)adventures, including in relation to the princely state of Jammu and Kashmir, through which region some British believed the Russians might also invade India.

Certainly by the early 1830s, the Russians had, in British eyes, become the greatest threat to India. Some time after Tsar Paul sent forces to Orenburg in 1801, the British heard of his proposed invasion. This exacerbated British anxieties. In 1813, following a short war in the Caucasus, Russia and Persia agreed the Treaty of Gulistan. This temporarily enhanced the Russians' position with Persia and weakened that of the British, who themselves had signed a treaty in 1801 with Persia supposedly to help this nation defend itself from enemies such as France and/ or Russia. The Treaty of Gulistan furthered both the ongoing seesaw of British-Russian competition for influence in Persia and the Persians' ability, albeit decreasing as Persian potency waned, to play the two empires off against each other. For the British, Persia was important for two reasons: firstly trade, with the East India Company having obtained Isfahan's permission to trade there as early as 1616; secondly, and, more importantly, to protect the western approaches to the Indian Empire from forces coming from, or

through, Persia or Persian-influenced Afghanistan. For the Russians, Persia controlled areas into which Russia could, and would, expand, particularly the Caucasus Mountains (Georgia; Armenia), the Caspian Sea, and Central Asia. In 1827–28, Persia lost much of its northern territories to the Russians. In 1831, the Russian fleet obtained control of the Black Sea and the strategic Dardanelles after Russia had helped to protect a weakened Ottoman Empire from invasion by a disenchanted subordinate ruler. This brought Russia closer to British naval assets located in the eastern Mediterranean and to Persia, from which the British believed Russia could mount an invasion of India. Similarly, the British perceived that the Russians could invade India from the Caucasus or Central Asia, into which regions Russia was slowly, almost imperceptibly, creeping—although it faced significant long-term opposition in the former and major difficulties in the latter.

In the late 1830s, the British became even more concerned about Russia. In 1837, a British military officer in Persia chanced upon a Russian party travelling through Persia, with permission from the ruling *shah*, to Afghanistan. The British believed that the Russians were encouraging the Persians to attack the (then) independent city-state of Herat, in western Afghanistan, that Persia claimed. Such Russian meddling and potential Persian action disquieted the British, particularly as Herat was only ‘six weeks march from the British frontier at Ludhiana’.⁶¹ It also was a major granary and potential re-supply point in Central Asia for any army moving eastwards, with the country between Herat and Kandahar providing ‘remarkable facilities for the passage of armies’.⁶² In 1837–38, the Persians attacked Herat, which was under the nominal control of its alcoholic ruler, Kamran Shah, a member of the Sudozai (or Sadozai) clan of the Popalzai tribe, and the actual control of Kamran’s powerful *vizier* (prime minister), Yar Mohammed. Kamran was a rival to the Kabul-based Afghanistan *amir* (chief; in this case, king), Dost Mohammad Khan, a member of the Barakzai tribe who had seized control in 1826 following serious internecine fighting between six Sudozai brothers who had variously sought, and fought, to rule Afghanistan from 1793. Taking advantage of Kamran’s ‘incapacity’, Persian forces besieged Herat for about nine months. Russian leadership and forces supported the Persians, particularly towards the end of the siege. These events caused great excitement in India, where some British feared that the Persians and/ or Russians might try to gain control of all of Afghanistan. Concurrently, a British officer helped the Heratis, while the British pressured Russia to desist. More significantly, Royal Navy marines captured a Persian island in the Persian Gulf and threatened to invade mainland Persia. This maritime action ‘encouraged’ the Persians to end their siege of Herat in September 1838. It did not, however, end British fears of opponents expanding their empires on land.

Persia’s demise as a great power in the eighteenth century was significant. As a result, modern Afghanistan came into being, its ruler later seized Kashmir from Mughal control, and the British Indian Empire’s greatest threat, Tsarist Russia, was able to expand into southern and central parts of Asia. Had Persia remained strong, these actions arguably may not have eventuated. Persia was strategically located immediately to the west of the Indian subcontinent. For ‘India’, the Persian threat had always been a realistic one, even though Iranians and Aryans in north India were from branches of the same Indo-European family that had left the (Russian) steppes to the north before 1000 BC. Persianate culture had long been highly influential in surrounding areas, such as modern India and Afghanistan, parts of which Persians had ruled going back to the Achaemenid Empire of 550–330 BC. Persianate culture had also been popular in the Mughal Empire, the Ottoman Empire and in the inimical Central Asian khanates of Khiva, Bukhara and Kokand, so named because rulers, or *khans* (except Bukhara, which had an *emir*), claimed descent from the Genghis Khan dynasty. The Persian language had been widely used in these Transoxanian courts, while Persian was often the *lingua*

franca used to conduct diplomacy. Additionally, when the second Mughal emperor, Humayan, lost his throne from 1540 to 1555, the Persian ruler gave him sanctuary and support. When Humayan regained his throne, he entrenched the use of Persian as the court language of the Mughal Court. This was about 100 years after the Kashmir court had started to use Persian.

Moving forward, the empire of the powerful ruler, Nadir Shah, who ruled Persia from 1732 and whose empire included parts of Afghanistan (Herat, Balkh) and Central Asia (Khiva, Bukhara), was extended to the Indus River after 1739. He obtained his Indus territories after his well trained and better equipped military forces savagely sacked and brutalised Delhi in 1739. Lovers of plunder, Nadir Shah's Persians stripped the Mughal capital of enormous wealth that was then equivalent to about £90 million sterling. Such wealth helped to finance future Persian military activities and further diminish Mughal rule.⁶³ Following Nadir's assassination in 1747, however, succession struggles weakened the Persian Empire and parts of it broke away. Importantly, from about 1750, one of Nadir's more able generals, Ahmad Shah Abdali, established his own empire based around his native Kandahar, after which he captured Herat and Kabul. Abdali, a Sudozai, later changed his name to Durrani, meaning 'pearl'. The entity that he unified, along with the addition of some captured territory, went on to become the modern state of Afghanistan that would pose the British significant strategic challenges and much tactical angst. In 1776, the Durrani made 'Cabool' (Kabul) the capital of Afghanistan.

Under the Durrani, Afghanistan's long-held connections continued with northern parts of the Indian subcontinent. In 1749, Ahmad Shah Durrani captured the area around Lahore. In 1752, he seized Kashmir from the weakened Mughals, whose 166-year hold on this region roughly 450 miles from Kabul had been reduced by Nadir Shah's destructive efforts in Delhi in 1739 and by the loss of territory west of the Indus River to him. Kashmiris had long enjoyed, or endured, trade, cultural and occasional political links with people who lived in eastern areas of what later came to be called Afghanistan. However, compared with the Kashmir-loving Mughals, Durrani and his lieutenants proved to be unenlightened rulers of Kashmir. During 1756–57, Durrani attacked and looted the Mughal capital just as his former overlord, Nadir Shah, had done. In 1761, Durrani defeated the powerful Marathas in central India, a significant factor that indirectly helped the rising British. However, with his forces isolated from distant Afghanistan, the Afghan withdrew. When Durrani died in 1773, his rule extended from the Oxus River in the north to the Arabian Sea in the south, and from Persia in the west to the Sutlej and Indus rivers in the east. After his death, in what appeared to be a Central Asian tradition, sibling rivalry weakened the Durrani Empire and reduced its size. This instability, coupled with the continuing demise of the Mughals, helped and encouraged the Sikhs. These Punjabis would eventually capture Afghan territory all the way to the foothills of the Suleiman Range that runs from northern Baluchistan to Waziristan. The territory captured by the Sikhs included Kashmir, in 1819. However, like the Afghans, the Sikhs were unenlightened rulers of Kashmir.

Meanwhile, in 1809, the East India Company, by then the leading power in the Indian subcontinent, had signed a treaty with the Sikh Empire that regulated their relations. The increasingly powerful and influential Ranjit Singh also agreed to support the British should Napoleon ever invade India. The Sutlej River was made the Anglo-Sikh boundary. All areas north of this river were available to the Sikh Emperor to conquer; all parts south of it were open to British control. This division prevented Ranjit Singh from moving east into British territory, including into the Cis-Sutlej area.⁶⁴ However, west from the Sutlej, the Sikhs could move south, although they left Sindh alone, which then had its own *nawab* (ruler) and was also difficult to access. Consequently, the Sikhs successfully expanded northwards and westwards into territory held by the Afghan Durrani, including Kashmir.

Concurrently, the British successfully sought additional territory and markets in Burma and north-east India. Despite the Sikhs capturing the Peshawar area in 1819 and the trans-Indus area between the Indus River and the Afghanistan foothills in the 1830s, the Afghans sought, and fought, to regain those areas. This included Peshawar, which traditionally had been the Afghans (warmer) winter capital. The Afghans were encouraged in their endeavours as Ranjit Singh's rule seemingly weakened. In a portent to future Afghan regimes, the Amir of Afghanistan, Dost Mohammad Khan, also used Islam to motivate his troops against the 'infidel' Sikhs.

Concurrent with Sikh gains in north-western India, the expansionist British developed a keen, but not necessarily sound, interest in ensuring that western areas beyond Sikh control, chiefly Afghanistan, remained free from the expanding Tsarist influence. One opportunity that Russia was seeking to exploit was the weakening Ottoman Empire, the so-called 'Sick Man of Europe', with Constantinople a significant prize that St Petersburg sought. Expansion into Ottoman territory was a sensitive issue with other European powers. However, the demise of Persian power and influence to Russia's south also had allowed the Russian Empire to prudently, and fairly freely, expand towards the Caspian and Aral seas, then beyond these bodies into western Turkestan. Fortuitously for Russia, this was a long way east of areas involving any European powers that were contesting for power, except Britain. Ultimately, Russia would successfully integrate all of western Turkestan into its empire as 'Russian Turkestan'.⁶⁵ Tashkent was its capital; a governor-general administered this region.

The British strategic interest in Russia—or Russophobic fear—informed some significant British actions as the East India Company expanded into northern and north-western India. One of the most important was the ongoing British strategy to ensure that a 'buffer' state existed between their territory and that of other great power opponents, perceived or actual. Under Ranjit Singh, with whom the British had a good relationship, Punjab provided one such buffer. Adjacent to Punjab on the west, Afghanistan possibly provided a second. Two buffer states should have been enough to comfort the British, whose maritime power was unsurpassed but whose land forces were always vulnerable. However, the Sikh emperor was waning. After Ranjit Singh's inevitable demise, the British clearly anticipated turmoil—and the possibility of territorial acquisitions. As a result, they were keen to ensure that Afghanistan would become an active, hopefully pro-British, buffer state that would ensure the non-contiguity of British and Russian territory. The British loved to have such buffer states in place, which was almost to their detriment, as they would discover on more than one occasion when trying to gain control of unruly Afghanistan.

A further strategic pastime that the British engaged in to monitor Russian expansion, to enhance trade opportunities and to circumvent possible conflict, was the shadowy 'Great Game'. The Russians' alliteration for this assertive 'athleticism' was *Torniree Tenye* (Турниры теней), the 'Tournament of Shadows'. Starting around the early 1800s but not then known by this name, the aim of this amorphous activity was simple: to seek or secure strategic advantage, particularly either to defend one's empire or to weaken one's rival. The main arenas for this ongoing Anglo-Russian contest were at the edge of their respective empires in Central Asia, Afghanistan and J&K. It involved agents from both sides engaging in various unobtrusive, or underhanded, tactics. These included: using men disguised as natives or natives themselves, who were skilled linguists, to spy in areas outside the British Indian Empire; soldiers acting as explorers or diplomats making expeditionary trips, 'scientific trips' or 'shooting trips' to 'sensitive' places, with such journeys involving 'matters of political moment' (or opportunism);⁶⁶ developing and maintaining forward 'listening' posts near borders to monitor people's movements; wooing, compromising or compelling

local rulers to provide physical or diplomatic support; having networks of spies in the other's territory; spreading disinformation about one's opponent; and, using propaganda. An associated, and profitable, Anglo-Russian competition involved trade. The Russians sold items such as 'Guns, knives, sugar, paper, lace and horses'. The British offered 'cotton cloth, silk, spices and tea ... from India and Kashmir; and European goods, especially French, china and glassware'.⁶⁷ Unlike a sporting contest, there was no clear winner in the Great Game/Tournament of Shadows. Indeed, the demise of the Tsar in 1917 and the necessity of the British to leave India in 1947 suggest that, ultimately, both sides lost this 'game'.

By 1839, senior British officers stationed in London and Calcutta, as well as British soldiers and administrators posted to remote western edges of the British Indian Empire, were clearly nervous about possible Russian control of Afghanistan. By the early 1830s, following France's demise, then Persia's, Russia had become the chief British strategic interest, especially in relation to Afghanistan. In 1823, the British had intercepted a letter from Russia to Ranjit Singh. In 1829, to British chagrin, the Russians had welcomed separate envoys from the rulers of Afghanistan and Punjab in St Petersburg. This followed Russia's aggressive wars with Persia (1827–28), in which Persia lost much of its northern territories to Russia, and with the Ottoman Empire (1828–29), after which Russia obtained territory on the Black Sea. Russian traders also were doing better in Afghanistan than their British rivals, including by offering concessionary finance and military assistance to the Amir. The British, having decided that they needed to oppose any Russian forces that might move towards their Indian Empire, sought to ensure that Afghanistan would act as a buffer state between the two empires. They considered that this required a supportive and pro-British Afghan ruler in power in Kabul.

As early as 1808, in what comprised an early move in the Great Game, the British first approached Afghanistan's then ruler, Shah Shuja ul-Mulk, who had won the Afghan throne in 1803, about concluding a treaty. In 1809, in Peshawar, which was then still under Afghan control, Shuja and a British envoy signed a mutual defence treaty to counter any threat coming from or through Persia, such as a possible Franco-Russian invasion of India via Afghanistan. The British had also been concerned to ensure that the Amir's intentions were honourable towards India, where the British had become the pre-eminent, but not unassailable, military power in 1804. However, in 1809, Shah Shuja lost power when a half-brother deposed him, imprisoned him in Attock, Punjab, and then in Kashmir, where there had been a rebellion. Shuja languished in Kashmir until Ranjit Singh freed him in a military expedition in 1813. A number of amirs followed Shuja, until Dost Mohammad Khan finally asserted himself in 1826. Meanwhile, Shuja resided in Ranjit Singh's capital, Lahore, from 1813–16. After escaping from house arrest there, Shuja made a failed attempt in late 1816 to recapture Kashmir, which was still politically unstable, from his half-brother. Shuja intended to use it as a base from which to finance and mount the recovery of his kingdom. Afghan rulers had always obtained significant revenue from relatively rich provinces such as Kashmir. Shuja's operation failed dismally and he fled to British-controlled Ludhiana.

By 1839, the British had major concerns about Afghanistan. They needed either to offer significant inducements to Dost Mohammad Khan to ensure his support and loyalty or they needed to enthrone a pro-British ruler themselves. The former task was a relatively easy proposition, although with uncertain results, given Afghans' pride, independent demeanour and frequent acts of regicide. The latter task was easier said than done: to ensure political change in Afghanistan would require a major military intervention. Undeterred, this is what the British decided to do: to invade Afghanistan. This was an implementation of their 'forward policy' by which British forces sought to actively defend

their frontiers, including by meddling in places where they had no direct control, such as in Afghanistan. The alternative was to use the moderate 'policy of masterly inactivity', also called the 'backward policy', 'stationary policy' and 'close border policy', by which British forces actively watched and protected their frontiers but did not interfere with, or intervene in, nations beyond these. The first approach, which had served the British well as they successfully advanced through the Indian subcontinent, appealed to assertive, adventurous imperialists keen to play the Great Game. Conservative administrators favoured the second approach as it was cheaper and easier to implement and sustain. It also usually involved more certainty and less loss of British lives in remote areas. In 1839, proponents of the forward policy won the day: the British would actively defend their frontier by militarily moving on Afghanistan.

Forward policy followers may have been inspired by recent actions involving Afghanistan that suggested that this country had weaknesses. In 1834, Shah Shuja had invaded Afghanistan and attempted to recapture what he called the 'Kingdom of Khurasan'.⁶⁸ He had the tacit support of Ranjit Singh, whose territory his forces had to cross. Shuja got as far as Kandahar, where Dost's forces defeated Shuja's forces, after which Shuja retreated to Ludhiana. Although defeated, it seemed that Shah Shuja still had some popularity in Afghanistan. Concurrently, the Sikhs held Peshawar against a counter attack by Dost's forces in 1835. In 1837, Afghan forces again attacked Sikh forces after the Punjabis captured Jamrud Fort, west of Peshawar at the entrance to the Khyber Pass. The Afghans attacked because Dost believed that Ranjit Singh's advancing forces were about to invade Afghanistan and annex it. After a particularly nasty and bloody battle at Jamrud, the Sikhs eventually won, which enhanced their hold over the Peshawar region. Their victory may have made the British feel that the politically divided and seemingly militarily poor Afghans could easily be defeated.

A British advance into Afghanistan was made possible because, shortly before Ranjit Singh's death in 1839, the East India Company had concluded an important agreement with the aging emperor that had major, and unforeseen, ramifications for the British. This agreement enabled the East India Company to move a 21,000-strong 'Army of the Indus' across Sikh territory. By then, Sikh territory included a long stretch of the Indus River, beyond which lay the most direct route to Afghanistan via Peshawar and the Khyber Pass, which Afridi tribesmen controlled at its southern end. After leaving Sikh territory, the British forces—fortuitously for Ranjit Singh—intended to invade Afghanistan and subdue Ranjit's enemies, whose ruler the Sikh detested, as did Dost detest Ranjit. This arrangement satisfied the Sikhs, who had long struggled with Dost's forces for control of territory located immediately west of the Indus River that was populated by Pukhtoons.⁶⁹ For the British, the aim was to replace the difficult Dost with the shambolic Shuja, who had been under British 'protection' since around 1816. Another possible Afghan replacement for Dost was the enigmatic Kamran Shah in Herat. However, Shuja's advantage, in British eyes, was his legitimacy due to having previously ruled Afghanistan. They considered him an amenable Afghan who would make a suitable, pro-British, ruler of Afghanistan.

Despite British desires to replace Dost Mohammad Khan, the Amir of Afghanistan was apparently prepared to agree a treaty with the British. This was partly because Russia was both unknown and distant from Afghanistan and because, in return for a treaty, Dost wanted British support to regain Peshawar, and its surrounds, from the Sikhs. No treaty was forthcoming. The British did not comprehend Dost's (realistic) analysis of Russia, nor were they prepared to support him against the Sikhs as they valued their treaty with Ranjit Singh. Equally, there was talk that Dost had already concluded an arrangement with Russia following a visit to Kabul by a Russian envoy, Captain Vitkevitch, in 1837. This possibly was to allow some sort of Russian diplomatic, even military,

presence in Afghanistan. In addition, the Russians may have offered Dost support to fight Ranjit Singh, in whose empire, and beyond, lay the attractive option of plunder. Interestingly, Vitkevitch also discussed 'the flourishing trade between Russia and Kashmir, which ... he hoped to help the Afghans reclaim from the Sikhs'.⁷⁰ During his visit to Kabul, Vitkevitch dined with the British envoy, Captain Alexander 'Bukhara' Burnes, who reported negatively to Calcutta about Russia's intentions. Interestingly, Burnes had made his name by successfully visiting distant Bukhara in 1832, and returning alive. His visit followed the first visit to Bukhara by a Britisher, William Moorcroft, in 1825, although this veterinarian and horse-trader died of fever while trying to return to India. Burnes' visit was also twelve years after the first ever visit to Bukhara by a Russian, Dr Eversmann, in 1820. A similar fate to Moorcroft awaited two later Britishers: Colonel Charles Stoddart and Captain Arthur Conolly. Stoddart ventured to Bukhara seeking information and a treaty in 1838; Conolly went to rescue the imprisoned Stoddart in 1841. In 1842, the Emir of Bukhara, who perceived the British to be weak and distracted at the time, executed both men as spies. The British could do little but attempt to protest to this distant despot. Prior to these various visits, the British had no idea about Central Asia and its landscape through which an invading Russian force might travel to India. The Russians similarly were ignorant about the terrain that separated its creeping empire from India, terrain that included major mountains, rivers and deserts.

As a result of preceding events concerning Afghanistan, on 1 October 1838, Lord Auckland, the British Governor-General in India issued the aggressive 'Simla Manifesto'. This declared Britain's intention to forcibly remove Dost Mohammad Khan as Amir of Afghanistan and replace him with Shah Shuja ul-Mulk. Essentially, the manifesto was a declaration of war against Dost, made because of the Afghan's alleged 'unprovoked attacks against the Sikhs and a "hostile" attitude towards the English'.⁷¹ This was somewhat supercilious. Any attacks against the Sikhs were part of the longstanding Afghan-Sikh struggle to control lands west of the Indus River in which the British had no direct involvement. Dost's 'hostile' attitude was actually the result of him neither bending nor succumbing to British strategic will. The issuing of the manifesto followed some heavy-handed and inept British diplomacy in Kabul during which the British representative, Burnes, reportedly belittled Dost and sought to impose British requirements on the Afghan ruler. This included Burnes telling an unbending Dost that the Afghan would be deposed if he entered into any treaty that the British thought was against their interests. The British, confronting such (perceived) hostility and believing that the Afghans had become pro-Russian, ensured that they had the support of Dost's enemy, Ranjit Singh, after which they formed their massive Army of the Indus. This army comprised 15,000 British-officered Indian troops from the British-administered Bengal and Bombay presidencies, British soldiers in the Queen's Army—Victoria had become Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in June 1837—and associated servants, animals and equipment. Accompanying it was 'a raggle-taggle army of 30,000 camp followers—bearers, grooms, dhobi-wallahs [laundrymen], cooks and farriers—together with as many camels carrying ammunition and supplies, not to mention officers' personal belongings'.⁷² As would become clear later, the 'Army of the Indus' was really the 'Army of the Indigent'.

In late March 1839, this British behemoth left India and headed for Afghanistan to ensure that this country was, at best, pro-British and, at worst, neutral. They succeeded, in the short term. Ranjit Singh, possibly to placate the Russians, had withdrawn his permission for part of the two-pronged British invasion force to travel via the Peshawar-Khyber Pass route to Jalalabad, in eastern Afghanistan, beyond which lay Kabul. Instead, the entire force had to travel by the longer southern route through Baluchistan and the Bolan Pass, about which the British knew little except that difficult

local tribesmen controlled this pass, then via Kandahar and Ghazni, to Kabul. This involved moving troops by barge down the Sutlej River, crossing the Indus River south of Multan, then uniting with forces from Bombay Presidency who had entered Sindh via Karachi. Around April 1839, the Army of the Indus successfully entered Afghanistan. Concurrently, Sikh forces prepared to attack the Afghans at the Khyber Pass, although such activity ceased with Ranjit Singh's death on 27 June. In August, the British force succeeded in imposing Shah Shuja on Afghanistan as its latest ruler. Few Afghans welcomed this restoration. Before British soldiers arrived in Kabul on 8 July 1839, Dost Mohammad had left this sullen city. (Dost would later hand himself over to the British, who then exiled him to India.) The Army of the Indus had confronted some fighting along the way, but their capabilities, discipline and some significant bravery overcame the opposition. Indeed, the successful British invasion was an easy and expected victory for the overconfident, but poorly informed and culturally unaware, invaders. Having easily achieved their objective of regime change, the British felt secure and certain of their power and prestige. Kabul quickly became a place where they felt free to socialise, indulge in liaisons, play cricket, race horses and generally enjoy the exotica of an interesting Asian city. Given this peaceful situation—as the British perceived it—most of the invading Army of the Indus withdrew from Afghanistan in October 1839. These British perceptions were totally incorrect, as they would soon devastatingly discover.

For the British, entering Afghanistan was relatively easy compared with holding or vacating this nation. Even though most Afghans knew nothing about, nor could they communicate with, the invading British, they disliked these infidels who wanted to capture Afghanistan, then presumably Central Asia beyond. The unwelcome occupiers created other problems for most Afghans: not only did they increase taxation, but also their presence increased the price and scarcity of food and fodder. Equally, conservative Afghans, who comprised most people, found some of the invaders' habits disturbing, such as women openly displaying their necks, ankles or legs. Many abhorred 'liaisons' by soldiers with local women. Some Afghans also perceived that the British had money and gold, which the locals wanted to get their hands on, and eventually did. Because they were imperious, heavy-handed and insensitive, many British also caused the Afghans' ire and hostility to increase daily, although almost all British chose to disbelieve or ignore this acrimony. They received a jolt when Afghans suddenly, unexpectedly and brutally killed 'Bukhara' Burnes in November 1841. Thereafter, the situation in Kabul deteriorated rapidly for the British, whose increasingly diabolical position was hindered by some inept political and military leadership, by devious politicking with equally devious Afghans, and by a major weakening of military discipline. With few other viable options available to them, the British decided to leave Afghanistan.

The British withdrawal, or retreat, from Afghanistan should have been relatively simple and orderly, but things went awry. After obtaining supposed security guarantees and safe passage in negotiations with Dost's son, Akbar Khan, 'some 4,500 fighting men ... encumbered by 12,000 non-combatants' left the Kabul garrison in January 1842 heading for Jalalabad some 80 miles, or five day's march, away.⁷³ Trekking eastwards, the retiring British-led force had to fight desperately. Increasingly, they were attacked by 30,000 of Akbar Khan's men and by other hostile Afghans disinclined to support Shah Shuja but supportive of Dost Mohammad. While the British later blamed, amongst other things, the treachery of Akbar Khan, they also were guilty of this charge, as well as of arrogance and ignorance. With low morale, no effective command and control, little or no discipline, and confronting brutal and relentless hostility, the withdrawal became every person for them-self. Only one Britisher, a Dr Brydon, and possibly a few *sepoys* (soldiers), made it to the safety of British-controlled Jalalabad. Brydon arrived there on 13 January 1842. A few British had been taken

hostage en route. The rest were killed by prouder, warlike and, according to the British, deceitful Pukhtoons who promised safety but delivered inimical force. This included Ghilzai tribesmen who controlled the western edges of the vital northern passes to India and whom the British had previously antagonised by unilaterally halving the subsidy paid of them. Starvation also took a heavy toll, as did bitter winter weather that included heavy snows. Indeed, the bad weather prevented much-needed British reinforcements from entering Afghanistan.

Despite installing Shah Shuja as their puppet in 1839, the British action in Afghanistan from 1839–41 ended abjectly in disaster. Confounding contemporary British strategic thought, not a single Muscovite had menaced any Londoner in Kabul; not a single Russian had killed any Britisher in Afghanistan; and not a solitary Slav had been sighted. Even more confounding, for the first time ever, British forces stationed in the subcontinent had disastrously experienced a massive loss of life, a considerable loss of military reputation, and significant amounts of money. ‘A mob of mere heathen savages, armed with home-made weapons had succeeded in routing the greatest power on earth. It was a devastating blow to British pride and prestige.’⁷⁴ Indeed, the first Afghanistan campaign was one of the worst losses that the British suffered anywhere during their time of vast and powerful empire. After extracting some short-term revenge in Afghanistan, the British kept away for almost forty years. Meanwhile, further west, the Persians had taken advantage of the British predicament to attack Herat again. Licking their wounds, the British ignored this issue for the time being.

In response to the British loss of ‘face’ and personnel and when the weather allowed the ‘fighting season’ to begin—it is too difficult to fight in Afghanistan in winter due to the cold, snow and inclement weather—the British sent an ‘Army of Retribution’ to Kabul in April 1842. After this army successfully entered Afghanistan, it freed some British soldiers held captive in Jalalabad and was stalled there for some time awaiting further permission from the new Governor-General, the Earl of Ellenborough, to proceed. Given the Company’s poor financial position, Ellenborough was concerned about money. The Army of Retribution took brutal revenge on Afghans, regardless of their involvement, or lack thereof, in actions against the British, particularly in Kabul where it arrived in September 1842. Shah Shuja had been killed five months beforehand. His son, Futeh, who ascended the Afghan throne, lasted fewer than three months. In October 1842, the Army of Retribution successfully fought its way out of Afghanistan, evacuating the remaining British forces and civilians holed up in Kandahar, Ghazni and Jalalabad. Soon after, the anguished, but not totally vengeful, British pragmatically released the former, and capable, ruler of Afghanistan, Dost Mohammad Khan. After an interruption in India where he had enjoyed a relatively interesting and easy exile, Dost quietly returned to Afghanistan and reasserted himself. With Dost’s release being unconditional, it was ‘back to the future’ for Afghanistan. Thereafter, the restored Afghan ruler kept his nation calm and generally maintained good relations with the British. He also remained baffled about why the British had felt the need to invade his poor and backward country. Dost was also far more realistic about the Russians, as well as the Persians, than the British would ever be.

Strategically, the British gained nothing by invading Afghanistan, except a nervous disposition about ethnic Pukhtoons who populated south-eastern Afghanistan and north-western India. They achieved nothing in relation to stemming Russia’s perceived advance towards India, although Russia itself, having experienced serious losses in its 1839 Khiva campaign designed to capture parts of Turkestan before the British did, may also have had second thoughts about military adventurism. Affected by their significant losses and lack of success, both the British and the Russians unofficially instituted a pause in their strategic contest. While this temporarily placated British strategic fears about Russia, it did not totally purge these fears from the British psyche. In the short term, however,

the British turned their attention to Punjab, whose ailing ruler controlled rich and productive agricultural lands, plus Kashmir.

The Sikh Empire and Punjab

The demise of the Sikh Empire relates directly to the creation of the princely state of Jammu and Kashmir. While this demise was mainly due to succession issues following Ranjit Singh's death in 1839, it was the British who finally finished the Sikh Empire. As British merchants and soldiers advanced warily beyond the Cis-Sutlej area into north-western India seeking trading and other opportunities, they confronted the powerful Sikh Empire. One reason for British wariness was that they were advancing into areas about which they knew little. While this was nothing new for the all-conquering British in India, it became more of an issue as they contemplated expanding beyond Punjab into wild and largely unknown Afghan territory, beyond which somewhere resided the Russians. The British did know that the Sikh Empire was capable, unified and strong and that, unlike the East India Company, it was not under the nominal control of weak Mughal rulers in Delhi. The Sikh Empire was an entity in its own right. It also was the only remaining power in the subcontinent that could rival, or at least withstand, the prestigious, all-conquering East India Company and its capable and disciplined military forces. The Sikh Empire was centred on Punjab,* a fertile and rich region that the Sikhs dominated and controlled. Their empire included nearby areas such as Peshawar, Kashmir, Jammu and Hazara. These areas would become important for the British following Ranjit Singh's death, and as they sought to assert and consolidate their control over north-western India thereafter.

(*The term 'Punjab' means 'five rivers' in Persian: punj—five; ab—waters. These rivers comprise, from east to west, the Sutlej, Beas, Ravi, Chenab, and Jhelum. They rise in Tibet (Sutlej), the Himalayas (Beas, Ravi) and J&K (Chenab, Jhelum). All eventually flow into the mighty Indus River before it leaves Punjab, which region roughly comprises the territory around these five rivers. Traditionally, Punjab stretched from the Indus River in the west to Delhi in the east. The Indus itself rises in Tibet, now known as the Autonomous Region of Tibet (or Xizang). Tibetans call this river Senge Khabab; Chinese call it Shiquanhe.⁷⁵ After leaving Tibet, the Indus flows through Ladakh (Indian J&K) and Gilgit-Baltistan (Pakistan-Administered J&K). It then enters Pakistan in northern Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Province, after which it flows roughly from north to south through Punjab and Sindh, entering the Arabian Sea east of Karachi. In 1947, the population of the Indus Basin was around 40 million people. Since 1947, the fertile Punjab region has been divided between India and Pakistan.)

The remarkable and powerful Sikh emperor, Ranjit (Ranjeet) Singh, had become undisputed leader of the Sikhs in 1799. Thereafter, he mollified or overcame his clan and tribal rivals, plus Afghan rulers, to create a unified Sikh Empire. This empire appeared to be almost unassailable while Ranjit Singh was alive. In 1802, Ranjit made Lahore, located astride the Ravi River in central Punjab, his capital. He also occupied the nearby Sikh holy city of Amritsar. Given that Ranjit was only born in 1780, these were major achievements. By 1813, the Sikh Empire was well entrenched throughout Punjab, and was expanding beyond. Following two attempts in 1813 and 1814, the Sikhs finally captured Kashmir in 1819 from the Durrani Afghans. This ended Muslim rule in, and over, this region, that had begun in 1339. It also returned Kashmir to a more active relationship and involvement with Punjab, which the Afghans' possession of Kashmir and their strong rivalry with the Sikhs had prevented. Kashmir became Ranjit Singh's most productive province, chiefly because of

the Sikhs' rapacious exploitation of all Kashmiris, regardless of their religion. Indeed, the Sikhs were even more brutal and exploitative than the Afghans, with Kashmiris suffering special taxes and oppressive measures, such as having Srinagar's main mosque, the Jami Masjid, closed for twenty years. By the 1820s, the Sikhs had extended their territory to include Peshawar and its surrounding vale, which territory they seized from their rivals to the west, the Durrani. In 1834, taking advantage of Afghani disunity, the Sikh Empire finally captured the troublesome trans-Indus area. This marked the end of Sikh efforts to capture and incorporate additional territory into their empire.

At its height, the Sikh Empire controlled the Punjab heartland and the areas surrounding this populated and productive region. In the east, the Sutlej River marked the boundary of the empire, beyond which resided the powerful British who, since around 1809, had controlled the adjacent Cis-Sutlej area into which Ranjit Singh had desired to expand. The major forward British military base was located at Ludhiana, which town Ranjit Singh had once briefly controlled. As neighbours, the British and the Sikhs generally enjoyed a good, treaty-based relationship. Westwards, Sikh territory extended tenuously beyond the Indus River, which marked the traditional western boundary of Punjab. Sikhs controlled the 'settled' areas located around the Vale of Peshawar, which ethnic Muslim Pukhtoons populated. Muslim Pukhtoons also inhabited the non-settled, or 'tribal', areas located in the foothills that rose from Peshawar westwards to Afghanistan. Because of the terrain and their temperament, these Pukhtoons were often difficult to control. To the north, the Sikh domain included the troublesome Hazara region, west of Kashmir, in which unruly ethnic Muslim Hazaras regularly caused problems for the Sikh Army.⁷⁶ Immediately southwards, the Sikh Empire extended to Sindh, which region the British encouraged Ranjit Singh to stay out of. The Sikh Empire was administratively divided into eight provinces: Gujrat;⁷⁷ Jalandhar (Jullundur); Jammu; Kangra; Kashmir; Lahore; Multan; and, Peshawar. A *nizam* (governor) administered each province. He had considerable internal control.⁷⁸

On 27 June 1839, a major catastrophe struck the Sikh Empire: the great and powerful Ranjit Singh finally died. While his death was inevitable, the loss of this powerful and capable ruler created an uncertain and unstable situation in the Sikh Empire. Ranjit's death resulted from a stroke, possibly invoked by excessive consumption of alcohol. An earlier debilitating stroke in 1835 probably hastened his demise. Thereafter, succession issues among his eight sons, three of whom succeeded him, quickly weakened the Sikh Empire. Indeed, its rapid disintegration showed how important Ranjit Singh had been to this empire's perpetuation. The Sikh Empire's internal problems also coincided with—or more likely heightened—the East India Company's desire to expand into the north-western part of the subcontinent beyond the Sutlej River. The desirous British were aware of some significant opportunities. Equally, they were wary of physically advancing into the Punjabi mire. The Sikh Empire had its powerful 29,000-strong Khalsa Dal (army). It was well equipped, including with 192 guns.⁷⁹ It was well-trained and well-led, including by forty-two senior foreign soldiers, comprising: twelve Frenchmen, seven Anglo-Indians, four Italians, four Germans, three Americans, three Englishmen, two Spaniards, one Russian, one Scot, and five others.⁸⁰ It was a major, unified and potent Punjabi force able to resist British expansion. Indeed, by around 1843, after the British had achieved important post-Afghanistan victories that secured Gwalior in central India and southerly Sindh, only the Sikhs had the martial ability to resist the British—provided they remained unified. Even though the British were wary, particularly after their debacle in Afghanistan, they were in a good position to advance their interests in Punjab, when the opportunity arose. They had a large standing army; they had re-grouped post-Afghanistan; and, temporarily, they were not concerned

about the Russians.

After Ranjit Singh's death, Anglo-Sikh relations became tense, even difficult, and it appeared only a matter of time until their forces clashed. A serious, possibly pre-emptive, raid by the Khalsa Dal into British territory in December 1845 instigated hostilities. The British Indian Army then fought the Sikhs, defeating them in February 1846 after a tough struggle and thousands of soldiers' deaths on both sides. Despite this victory, Punjab remained unstable. The Khalsa Dal was still a potent if factionalised force, while the British were reluctant to press their victory and directly impose their rule on this unstable, uncertain area at the north-western edge of their empire. Instead, the British sought to oversee the Sikh's weakened and fragmenting administration by imposing a British Resident on it. This Britisher sought to direct the Sikh court's operations and to control Punjab using British agents, both for British advantage and to secure the border with Afghanistan. As reparations, the losing Sikhs were forced to pay a large indemnity equivalent to £1.5 million to the British to cover the victor's war costs; to cede to the British some fertile territory along the Sutlej River, and associated revenue; and, to cede the Kashmir region to the British. After twenty-seven years of Sikh rule under ten governors in what was possibly 'the darkest period in the history of Kashmir',⁸¹ Kashmir passed to the British. Their rule of Kashmir was brief: it only lasted one week. Quickly and rather inexplicably, British authorities sold this region to Raja Gulab Singh, a Dogra from Jammu whose kingdom had been part of the Sikh Empire. This significant transaction and this important man are discussed below.

In April 1848, a second Anglo-Sikh war started which, again, the British won. This war began after a serious anti-British rebellion started around the Multan area of southern Punjab. It spread throughout the volatile Sikh Empire. Soon after the uprising started, Dost Mohammad Khan opportunistically tried to regain Peshawar for Afghanistan. He failed. In March 1849, after some very tough fighting against a skilled and tough opponent, the better-led British Indian Army finally defeated Sikh forces. After their second victory, the British decided to annex and directly rule all of north-western India from the Sutlej River up to the new borders with both Afghanistan and princely J&K. Administered as the Province of Punjab, this new area comprised some 80,000 sq. miles and four million people. A subset of this province was the north-western frontier region, or Frontier Districts as it was officially called. It differed from Punjab because of its dominant Pukhtoon population most of whom were Muslims, and some differing socio-political issues. Fifty-two years later, in 1901, Calcutta formally separated this sub-region from Punjab and named it the North-West Frontier Province. Meanwhile, the East India Company administered the entire Punjab Province via a three-man Board of Administration. It was under the ultimate control of the Governor-General in remote Calcutta in winter, or the nearer Simla in summer, and a very distant Court of Directors in London all year. By 1848, the British also were the dominant power in Sindh and an area to its west that they called 'Baluchistan', which included the Khanate of Kalat, whose ruler was actually an ethnic Brahui.⁸² British control of Baluchistan was strengthened around 1877 after the khan agreed to lease the Bolan Pass and the nearby Quetta area to them. The British then developed Quetta into a major military cantonment.

After acquiring control of the traditional invasion routes into mainland India that were located in the Frontier Districts' north-western uplands, such as the Khyber and Kurram passes, British troops sought to supervise the Pukhtoons who populated these areas. Unlike the Sikhs, who only were interested in controlling the lowlands, the British were singularly intent on controlling the heights of the Frontier Districts and, indeed, of any region into which they advanced. In north-western India, they therefore sought to control the uplands that separated India from Afghanistan as they feared that

any invasion by a foreign power would come through one or more of the 108 or so strategic passes of varying lengths and widths located there. This included the larger passes through which invading armies, including Afghan armies, traditionally had descended to attack and plunder the subcontinent. Conversely, the Sikhs generally had little or no inclination to extend their territory into, let alone past, the foothills at the end of the Indus plain. Indeed, to some extent, the Sikhs had been reluctant to go beyond even the Indus River, which provided a natural boundary at the end of the north-western plains and which traditionally marked the end, or the beginning, of Muslim Pukhtoon lands. Certainly, the Sikh plainsmen avoided advancing into the uplands beyond the Indus River because they did not want to deal with the fierce and troublesome Pukhtoon tribes of a different religion who inhabited these areas. These tribes included Afridis, Mohmands and Waziris, who knew the mountainous areas intimately. Such tribesmen had unsavoury reputations as tough, hardy, revenge-oriented warriors. Some of these traits resulted from their adherence to *Pukhtoonwali*, a complex code of conduct or honour for individuals and communities that included revering independence and seeking revenge. The code also involved providing hospitality, asylum and protection to strangers and guests, even if it was an enemy seeking sanctuary.

To their ongoing chagrin, the British could not totally control the Pukhtoons, particularly using conventional military tactics against tribesmen who used ambushes and/ or deadly sniper fire to harass soldiers. Nevertheless, for security reasons, the British couldn't leave the Pukhtoons alone. Therefore, they sought to 'manage' tribesmen using a 'carrot and stick' or 'cash and cavalry' approach. The 'carrot' involved allowing autonomy and providing subsidies, usually monetary, distributed via tribal leaders or elders known as *maliks*. These cost the British Rs 30 million each year.⁸³ The 'stick' was the rapid, punitive and destructive use of military force in response to misdemeanours and atrocities committed against British personnel or interests—the so-called 'butcher and bolt' tactic. In the fifty years until 1900, the British mounted sixty separate military operations against tribes in India's north-western frontier region, while there was a general uprising in 1897 that 43,000 soldiers suppressed.⁸⁴ This compared with twenty-three military operations throughout the rest of India during this time. Similarly, between 1850 and 1922, the British sent an expedition annually against one or more of the tribes in the frontier area.⁸⁵ Such activity was partly due to British unease about a possible invasion by a foreign power using strategic passes located in these tribesmen's areas. Given their histories, an invasion of India via NWFP, or via Baluchistan, was a valid British concern. The same did not apply to J&K, however.

Jammu and Jammuities

We now come to an intriguing matter concerning the Sikh Empire: the significant role played by two powerful and influential brothers from Jammu, Gulab and Dhyan (Dhian) Singh. In particular, as we shall see, the British took Raja Gulab Singh very seriously. The Sikh Empire had many non-Sikhs serving as soldiers and administrators. These included Gulab and Dhyan Singh, plus their other brother, Suchet, from the Jammu area that was located immediately to the south of Kashmir and north of the Sikh Empire's Punjab heartland. Jammu had some strategic importance as its hilly uplands were relatively remote from traditional invasion routes into India that crossed Punjab. People had sought refuge from invaders in such areas, including most recently from marauding Afghans. Nevertheless, there was no distinct geographic division between Jammu and Punjab. Essentially, Jammu was an undulating-to-hilly extension of the Punjab plains that rose northwards to the Pir Panjal range located at the southern edge of the Kashmir Valley, with this range providing a natural boundary

between Kashmir and Jammu. There also was no political separation between Jammu and Punjab, as maps of the time show. Additionally, the Jammu region was an area to which Punjabis travelled for trade, conquest, familial and religious reasons, as did Jammuities to Punjab. In a direct line between Lahore and Srinagar (which distance is roughly 180 miles/290 km), Jammu town, after which the region was named, was located roughly midway. However, Lahore was considerably easier, and more attractive, for Jammuities to access. They therefore did not seek to actively escape from the overlordship of Sikhs, with whom they had considerably more in common ethnically and culturally than with Kashmiri Muslims. Unlike today, there also were no rigid political or economic divisions or man-made barriers between Punjab and Jammu, with the rulers of Jammu often having lands in Punjab, and vice versa.

As the capital of the Sikh Empire, Lahore was a major attraction for non-Sikhs. One reason was that the Khalsa Dal offered significant opportunities for capable outsiders to work, fight and prosper. This army included many Muslims and Hindus, and even some Christians, with most of the latter being foreigners. Equally, because of Ranjit Singh's more secular attitude, people could make significant reputations in the Lahore Court, regardless of their religion. Non-Sikhs who prospered included the two Hindu brothers from nearby Jammu: Gulab and Dhyan Singh. They played a major part supporting and advancing the Sikh Empire, and their careers within it. Indeed, they became powerful and prestigious officials who enjoyed Ranjit Singh's trust and affection. Of particular significance to our story is the eldest brother, Gulab Singh. Writing in 1831, a well-informed Frenchman visiting Lahore stated that the illiterate Gulab Singh was 'Ranjit Singh's favourite and successor'.⁸⁶ A later biographer considered the Jammuite to be 'the most influential personage in the Sikh Empire and [that he] was its chief feudatory'.⁸⁷ While Gulab and Dhyan undoubtedly helped Ranjit Singh to rule his domain, in return the Sikh Empire gave legitimacy to their rule of principalities and smaller jagirs in the Jammu region, plus some significant privileges. It was a symbiotic relationship in which all parties prospered.

Gulab Singh was an ethnic Hindu Dogra of the Jamwal Rajput clan. The Dogras peopled the hilly tract of country at the northern end of the Punjab plains located between the Chenab and Ravi rivers. The word 'Dogra' may be a derivation of the word 'Dograth', which refers to this country.⁸⁸ Gulab was born in 1792 at Samba, Jammu, into a minor arm of the local ruling clan. His father was a soldier. They were descended from Dogras who established their rule in the Jammu region in the mid-1700s as the Mughal Empire weakened substantially and as Afghans and Sikhs vied for power in the north-west of the subcontinent. By the time Gulab was seven years old, Ranjit Singh had captured Lahore and made it his capital. In 1808, Ranjit captured the Jammu area, which ended whatever autonomy Jammu had previously enjoyed. The next year, Gulab Singh, aged seventeen and with little or no education, determined that the Sikhs offered the best opportunity for him to advance his status. This possibly followed three years serving the Raja of Kishtwar, who Gulab apparently joined as he had quarrelled with the then Raja of Jammu. Gulab joined the Sikh Army as a *sepo*y and did well, fighting with accomplishment in many Sikh actions. These included several campaigns against the Afghans, fighting in Kashmir (1813–14; 1819), Jullundur (1815) and Multan (1818), and successfully putting down a revolt in the Jammu hills (1819). In Jammu, Gulab used his substantial local knowledge and growing reputation for duplicity and brutality to bring to heel this ill-disciplined province whose inhabitants were notoriously difficult to manage and collect revenue from. As a result, Gulab became feared for 'his cruelty and tyrannical exactions',⁸⁹ which became so excessive that one biographer labelled the Jammuite a 'veritable economic vampire'.⁹⁰

Because Gulab Singh was a brave and capable soldier, in the 1810s, he caught the eye of the Sikh Maharaja. This was significant as both men thereafter engaged in a mutually beneficial partnership that brought them extensive benefits. For the effective but vigilant Maharaja Ranjit Singh, Gulab provided a non-Sikh ally whom the ruler could trust, an important factor in a fractious empire in which Ranjit was the senior Sikh. The ambitious Gulab Singh used Ranjit as a vehicle for Gulab to advance himself and his interests. Gulab Singh apparently first came to Ranjit Singh's notice in the Kashmir campaign of 1813, after which Gulab was given control of the Reasi area, north of Jammu, in 1815. Later, because of his actions suppressing the uprising in Jammu in 1819, Ranjit Singh recognised the Jammu as ruler of Jammu in 1822. Significantly, Maharaja Ranjit Singh personally attended Raja Gulab Singh's installation ceremony. Gulab was thirty years old.

Unusually, Ranjit allowed his trusted subordinate considerable autonomy in the Dogra-dominated but unruly tributary state, including allowing Gulab to maintain his own armed forces, largely unhindered. By 1823, when Ranjit Singh granted Jammu to Gulab Singh as a hereditary principality, the Dogra had added the areas of Rajouri, Basohli, Kishtwar and Akhnur to 'his' state. Later, in 1834, Gulab's forces captured the rugged and remote region of Ladakh, which was crossed by four major mountain ranges: Karakoram, Ladakh, Zaskar and Great Himalaya. This, arguably, was Gulab's most important gain as he obtained control of the valuable trade in fine wool, or *pashm* (hence, pashmina), produced by goats in Ladakh and surrounding areas. Pashm was used in the important and lucrative production of Kashmiri shawls. In 1837, Gulab suppressed a rebellion in Poonch, a jagir in the north-west of greater Jammu belonging to his brother, Dhyan. Locals still remember Gulab Singh's brutality in this and other actions, as I discovered in 1999.⁹¹

Possibly, Ranjit Singh allowed Gulab Singh to have his own army because the Jammu was a cagey and capable individual well able to look after his own interests. Equally, Gulab and his Dogra kinsmen had fought with Sikhs armies and had gained great standing, influence and privileges. Gulab may have argued successfully that he needed his own forces to keep his or his family's unruly areas under control and to aid, even advance, revenue collection for the Sikh Empire. A further possibility was that Gulab Singh was simply an amenable person who got along with certain people, particularly those in positions of power. Certainly, by 1831, Gulab Singh was a close confidant, even friend, of Ranjit Singh. Indeed, Jacquemont contended that 'after Runjeet Sing [sic] he [wa]s the greatest lord in the Punjab ... [and] better obeyed at a distance than Runjeet Sing [sic]'.⁹² Taking advantage of his relatively relaxed situation with the Sikh Emperor, Gulab used his forces, ostensibly in Ranjit Singh's name, to capture, or to attempt to capture, territory located close to Jammu. For the strategic Jammu, such territory was in his self-perceived 'sphere of influence'.

Gulab Singh's position in the Sikh Empire was also strong because other family members had senior positions and influence in Ranjit Singh's court, and because these Dogra kinsmen worked together. Significantly, Ranjit Singh 'had a special eye for personal beauty',⁹³ something of which the Jammu Rajas apparently had plenty. Gulab's younger brother, the allegedly graceful Raja Dhyan Singh (born 1796), was one of Ranjit's 'favourites'. Highly capable, Dhyan was also influential, being appointed to the important office of Grand Chamberlain in 1819. In 1827, Ranjit Singh gifted him rulership of the areas of Bhimber, Chibbal and Poonch, in western Jammu. In 1828, this Dogra rose to become Prime Minister of the Sikh Empire and, some time later, *Raja-e-Rajgan* (Raja of Rajas). Another favourite was Gulab and Dhyan's younger, and handsome, brother, Suchet Singh (born 1801). Among all courtiers, however, Dhyan's son, Hira (born 1816), was Ranjit's favourite. The emperor was apparently unable to bear being parted for long from the handsome, possibly

catamite, Jammuite.⁹⁴ Apart from their 'elevating' good looks, the Jammuities' high positions resulted from some significant political, military and administrative skills and a strong ability to work together. This latter had been formalised by a 42 clause agreement signed by ten Singh family members in 1837. These included, in order of age: the three royal brothers, Gulab, Dhyan and Suchet; their sons, Mian (prince) Udham (Gulab's eldest), Raja Hira (Dhyan's eldest), Mian Sohan (Gulab's second), Mian Jawahar (Dhyan's second), Mian Ranbir (Gulab's third, and ultimate successor), Mian Moti (Dhyan's third) and Mian Huttoo (possibly Gulab's fourth son by a 'slave girl'). Suchet was childless. The pact apparently operated well until Dhyan's death in 1843.⁹⁵

By the time Ranjit Singh died in 1839, the Jammu Dogra rajas were a 'remarkably prominent force at the Lahore court',⁹⁶ albeit not without enemies or rivals in an unstable and difficult period for the Sikh Empire. Due to their skills and actions, particularly as Ranjit aged and became infirm, the Dogras' influence and power had been increasing. Indeed, 'the three Jammu brothers were at the height of their powers'.⁹⁷ All were senior administrators or generals in the Sikh Empire. Together, Gulab, Dhyan and Suchet Singh held some eighty-five jagirs of varying sizes in the Jammu area mainly, and in Punjab. Worth Rs 1.8 million, these provided a third of Ranjit Singh's revenue. Gulab's jagirs, one of which gave him a monopoly over the salt trade, were worth Rs 740,000; Ranjit's favourite, Hira's, were worth Rs 462,000; Suchet's Rs 307,000; and, Dhyan's Rs 291,000.⁹⁸ While Dhyan seemingly was the 'poorest' of these Jammuities, he was the most important due to his influential and powerful position at the Lahore Court where he almost certainly accumulated considerable physical wealth, such as gold, money and jewels. Dhyan also may have shared his jagirs with his son, Hira, who was in a better position to administer them. Conversely, Gulab, who had less desire to engage in courtly activities and intrigue in Lahore than his brothers and his nephew, Hira, had been able to consolidate his position at home in Jammu after Ranjit Singh died. With the Jammu principality essentially being Gulab's creation, he was best placed among the Dogra princes to further advance his political and economic wellbeing.

After, and possibly because of, Ranjit Singh's death, Gulab's armed forces undertook further expansive military activity in Ladakh, Baltistan and Gilgit. In 1842, Jammu forces recaptured Ladakh, which Gulab had lost briefly to a Tibetan-Chinese force. Beyond Ladakh lay Tibet, which presented a totally different challenge and experience for the Jammuities. Tibet was even more remote than Gilgit or Baltistan, with which regions Tibet had religious and cultural connections. Conversely, Tibetans had few, if any, connections with Jammu, a remote region far to Tibet's south-west. Indeed, most Tibetan links with India were via Sikkim and other places east of Ladakh. Significantly, Tibet also had major connections with China. In the 1841 Tibet campaign, Dogra forces under General Zorawar Singh, a Hindu Rajput from Jammu, initially did well against their weaker Tibetan opponents. The Dogras nominally extended the Sikh empire into Tibet as far as Gartok, on the upper reaches of the Indus River, and to Lake Mansarover, a sacred Hindu-Buddhist pilgrimage place located near Nepal where the Brahmaputra (Yarlung Tsangpo in Tibet), Indus, Karnali (a major tributary of the Ganges, or Ganga) and Sutlej rivers all rise. By October 1841, however, the Tibetans had re-grouped and had been joined by a strong Chinese army. Concurrently, the Dogras, distant from Jammu, were enduring major re-supply problems, food shortages and untenable freezing conditions. In the ensuing battle, the Chinese-dominant force killed Zorawar Singh and some 4,000 of his soldiers. This Chinese force then advanced as far as Leh, which brought Gulab's campaign to the attention of the displeased Indian Government that was already agitated by the recent slaughter of the Army of the Indus in Afghanistan. Concurrently, Calcutta was also trying to conclude a treaty with China where British forces were

fighting the first 'Opium War'. It 'encouraged' Gulab Singh not to undertake any further military activity in Tibet or in China. Thereafter, Dogra troops expelled the Chinese from Ladakh, after which the Sikhs, Dogras, Chinese and Tibetans agreed an important treaty. This restored the previous loose boundaries, including in relation to Aksai Chin, a 'desolate plateau 17,000 feet above sea level, where nothing grew and no one lived' located between the Karakoram and Kunlun ranges in southern Sinkiang (now Xinjiang) and to Ladakh's north-east.⁹⁹ Under the treaty, Tibetan authorities granted Gulab Singh a jagir in Tibet, although its 'pecuniary value [wa]s insignificant' and the annual rent was difficult to collect due to its remoteness. Similarly the treaty agreed that a commercial caravan or trade mission, the 'Lapchak Mission', went every third year from Leh to Lhasa carrying presents and letters. A reciprocal mission, the 'Choba Lhasa', went from Lhasa to Leh.¹⁰⁰ These did not provide substantial financial gains for Gulab Singh or the Tibetans. Significantly, however, the imprecise 1842 treaty would later become the basis for Indian and Chinese claims to Aksai Chin.

Post-Ranjit Singh, the Sikh court also divisively split into factions. One of the most powerful was led for a time by Dhyani and Gulab Singh, although they sometimes didn't see eye-to-eye on political matters, albeit rarely. One major disagreement concerned deciding which Sikh to support as ruler after Ranjit's death. This was a fluid situation as three of the dead emperor's eight sons had been made rulers of the Sikh Empire in quick succession: Kharak Singh (1839–November 1840, who was followed by his wife, Chand Kaur, as regent until January 1841); Sher Singh (1841–43); and the six-year old Dhalip (Daleep, Dalip) Singh (1843–49), whose powerful mother, Maharani Jindan Kaur, was regent, although the Khalsa Dal was probably in effective control. In the insecure times immediately after Ranjit Singh's death, Jindan Kaur had Dhalip Singh taken to Gulab Singh for safekeeping. Meanwhile, during a two-month siege in Lahore, Gulab stoutly defended the Maharani of Punjab, Chand Kaur, against the forces of a rival ruler, Sher Singh, whom Dhyani supported. After the siege ended, Gulab opportunistically and rapaciously plundered wealth from the Sikhs' treasury by removing to Jammu sixteen carts filled with rupees and silver coins and having 500 trusted horsemen each carry away a bag of gold *mohurs*. (A *mohur* was worth about fifteen silver rupees.)¹⁰¹ In 1844, Sikh forces sought to recover this wealth by attacking Gulab in Jammu. Equally, the Sikhs may have attacked the Jammuite because he had attempted to put a Sikh of his choice on the Lahore throne, an operation opposed by Gulab's brother, Dhyani. The Sikhs' attack resulted in Gulab yielding to Lahore, after which he spent some time in prison there during 1845. He escaped, however, after which he was able to watch the unfolding of the Sikh Empire from the remoter, and safer, confines of Jammu.

Apart from being geographically isolated, Gulab Singh was well-placed to take advantage of events in Punjab because of another circumstance that he enjoyed. As a senior military commander in the Khalsa Dal, Gulab had visited other places and met other people. This included some influential Britishers. In 1842, British soldiers and some soldiers in the Khalsa Dal were involved in the Army of Retribution sent to punish Afghans for destroying the Army of the Indus. The British had insisted on Sikh help to return to Afghanistan, and, more immediately, to relieve Jalalabad town, which Afghans were still besieging. Not wishing to alienate the severely disgruntled British, the Sikhs dispatched some soldiers. One of these was the powerful, influential and cagey General Gulab Singh, whom the Sikh leadership had reluctantly transferred from active service in Hazara to nearby Peshawar in early 1842. Significantly, Singh had a number of meetings and dealings with an increasingly influential British official, Henry Lawrence, who was in Peshawar helping to organise the Army of Retribution. At one meeting, British forces honoured General Gulab Singh with a full military parade and salute. This was a significant gesture for a native general in the Sikh Empire whose support the British then needed. Equally, the prescient Lawrence saw benefit in securing Gulab's goodwill. The British took

the Jammu seriously, particularly in relation to his ability in 1842 to influence military engagements involving the Sikhs—and possibly also in the future.

Gulab may have ingratiated himself with Lawrence—or vice versa. Certainly, a friendship between the two men developed. The strategic and prescient Jammu made it clear that he was ‘anxious to afford all help [to the British], provided it was clearly understood that the [British] obligation was to him and not to the Lahore Government’,¹⁰² which Gulab knew would continue to confront serious problems following Ranjit Singh’s death. As a reward for his important services to be rendered in Afghanistan, the British promised Gulab the Afghan town of Jalalabad. They felt that his reputation for ‘severe authority ... would be a fitting punishment for [Jalalabad’s inhabitants’] lawlessness’,¹⁰³ plus that the Jammu might actually control this town full of unruly Afghans. Equally, the British possibly offered Jalalabad as an inducement to keep Gulab out of Ladakh, where they had strategic concerns, including not upsetting the Chinese in Sinkiang. Gulab declined the British offer. His interests lay in Jammu, Kashmir, Ladakh and Sinkiang, not in remote and difficult eastern Afghanistan, even though he apparently got on well with Pukhtoons. Despite the rebuff, Lawrence and Singh had begun an important conversation. Possibly, they discussed perceptible futures for the Sikh Empire and the British Empire, and for Gulab’s Jammu domain within these empires. Certainly, the Britisher and the Jammu would meet post-Afghanistan—to mutual advantage.

(Gulab Singh’s meetings with Henry Lawrence in Peshawar in early 1842 ended a bad period for powers seeking to secure territory in remote areas against hostile forces. During 1839–41, over 16,000 people (4,500 troops; some 12,000 civilians) and untold animals in the ragged and retreating Army of the Indus were killed in Afghanistan. In February 1842, Gulab Singh learned that 4,000 of his own forces fighting Tibetan and Chinese troops in Ladakh and Sinkiang had been killed or had perished due to harsh winter conditions or starvation. In 1839, Russia lost 1,000 soldiers while trying to capture Khiva, supposedly to free Russians slaves. The Russians had also wanted to capture lands in Turkestan before, as they perceived it, the British headed north after ‘conquering’ Afghanistan in 1839. It was a bad few years for expeditionary forces.)

In the post-Ranjit Singh power struggles—watched closely by the British who were ready militarily to pounce on Punjab—the Singh brothers and Hira Singh played major parts. Ultimately, Dhyani, Suchet and Hira supported the wrong factions. Dhyani was assassinated in Lahore in 1843. Soon after, in 1844, Hira, who had been made the young Maharaja Dhalip Singh’s *vazir* (prime minister), was killed. So too was Suchet, then a significant military commander of a large Sikh force and one of Hira’s opponents. The great survivor was Gulab Singh. It might be Kautilyan or Machiavellian to suggest that Gulab had any part in the deaths of his brothers and nephew, partly because he was not in Lahore when they occurred. However, Gulab was a master of intrigue who was certainly advantaged by, or able to take advantage of, these tragic events. Soon after the deaths of his relations, for example, Gulab ‘inherited’ the unmarried Suchet’s principality of Ramnagar, in eastern Jammu. Later, Gulab sidelined Dhyani’s descendants from some of their father’s lands and from a share of the Jammu kingdom to which they felt entitled because of the 1837 family agreement. Gulab’s intriguing went even further and, like all good intrigue, his Sikh masters were not fully aware of it. Perceptively, the Jammu was aware that the Sikh Empire was in serious decline. Presciently, he realised that the expansive British would almost certainly seek to enlarge their Indian Empire by entering the unstable Sikh domains and capturing territory. Pragmatically, he deigned that he would do best by staying out of any forthcoming Anglo-Sikh war. The scheming Gulab Singh therefore decided to enter into a secret, mutually-opportunistic and mutually-beneficial relationship with the powerful

East India Company in which he would remain neutral. Equally, it seems, the British had agreed to reward him for his (dis)loyalty should they succeed.

Gulab's attitude may have arisen because of the Sikhs' previous harsh treatment of him and his family, treatment that certainly made Gulab less amenable to support Sikh rulers in Lahore, even though he was still under their (increasingly nominal) suzerainty. Equally, Gulab may have seen better opportunities by supporting, or at least not opposing, the ascending power in north-western India beyond the Sutlej River, the British, rather than the weakening Sikhs. A third possibility is that some senior British officials, such as Henry Lawrence, who knew Gulab Singh from their time together in Peshawar in 1842, either encouraged him or negotiated with him to stay out of any future British military engagement with the Sikhs. Either way, around late 1845, Gulab decided to weaken his ties with the Sikhs. He chose to avoid any involvement by him and his battle-hardened troops in the forthcoming Anglo-Sikh military struggle—even though the Sikh leadership not unexpectedly had asked him, a senior general in the Khalsa Dal, to command their forces. To confirm his genuineness to the British, Gulab tendered his son, Ranbir, as a hostage. Gulab did so because some British distrusted him over his alleged support in 1839 for anti-British Afghan tribes and supporters of Dost Mohammad living in Peshawar.

By early 1846, Gulab Singh was very much in favour with the British. The two parties seemingly had agreed to actively cooperate with one another, albeit in secret and at a distance until the British defeated the Sikhs. To help this defeat, Gulab almost certainly provided the British with valuable intelligence about Sikh capabilities, tactics and deployments. In return for his neutrality and services, the Jammuited was to receive great British gratitude and gratuities. Given Gulab Singh's leadership and tactical capabilities, and given his prestige and power in the still strong, yet highly unstable, Sikh Empire, his non-participation in the (first) Anglo-Sikh war of 1845–46 was an extremely important military, tactical and psychological boost for the British. Certainly, the non-involvement of Gulab and his capable troops from Jammu was enough to tip a tough and difficult war with the Sikhs in favour of the British. This, indeed, is what happened. Concomitantly, this also sealed Kashmir's fate.

PART TWO

JAMMU AND KASHMIR, 1846–1947

The sale of Kashmir and the creation of J&K

From December 1845, British and Sikhs forces fought in Punjab. In Gulab Singh's self-imposed strategic absence, Sikhs forces were hindered by some poor or half-hearted generalship. Conversely, some determined fighting by the British and Indian armies ensured that they won the first Anglo-Sikh war, after which the British obtained some significant financial and territorial spoils. Many British (hypocritically) considered the non-participant, Gulab Singh, to be devious, or a detested villain, or 'the worst native [they had] ever come into contact with, a bad King, a miser, and a liar'.¹ Nevertheless, the British had readily accepted the dubious Gulab's neutrality, and his important intelligence, both of which factors helped the British to defeat the Sikhs, a victory that the British were pleased to achieve. That the strategically challenged British felt some obligation to Gulab Singh is shown by their action of converting their new possession of Kashmir into cash by hastily selling this area to the supposedly despicable—but clearly amenable—Jammuite. While this sale was couched in mercantile terms, the British appeared to be rewarding Gulab for his strategic ambivalence and non-participation in the first Anglo-Sikh war. The sale also may have been the result of some sort of pre-war deal agreed by the British and Gulab, with Henry Lawrence a possible intermediary in arranging this deal. Certainly, both the British and Gulab Singh benefitted from the transaction. The losers were the Sikhs and the people of Kashmir. The Sikh Army lost a skilled general, his able forces and the first Anglo-Sikh war. For Kashmiris, the majority of whom were Muslims, Kashmir was sold like a mere chattal to a Hindu for whom Muslims personally already had little respect or regard, and possibly vice versa. Whatever political desires Kashmiris had for their homelands were totally ignored. The sale was a cold, hard real estate transaction in which the Kashmiris were never allowed to offer a bid.

The history of the sale of Kashmir is as follows. After some tough fighting, British forces finally defeated the Sikhs in late February 1846. On 9 March 1846, Gulab's good offices were used to conclude a treaty between British officials and Maharaja Dhalip Singh, Ranjit Singh's youngest son and the latest ruler of the troubled Sikh Empire. As a minor, the eight-year old Sikh 'ruler' was under the tight control of his mother, Maharani Jindan, and the newly-imposed British Resident to Punjab, Brevet-Major Henry Lawrence,² whom Gulab Singh already knew and who was a signatory to the treaty. Among other things, Dhalip Singh—conveniently for Gulab—was compelled by this 'Treaty of Lahore' 'to admit [Gulab Singh] to the privileges of a separate Treaty with the British Government' and to recognise the independent sovereignty of 'Rajah Golab Sing' in Gulab's existing territories and in any territory 'made over' (transferred or sold) to Gulab by the British Government. Tellingly and despite having just betrayed Dhalip, this was 'in consideration of the good conduct of Rajah Golab Sing'.³ One week later, on 16 March 1846, as agreed in the Treaty of Lahore, the British signed a treaty called the 'Treaty of Amritsar' with their collaborator, the Raja of Jammu, Raja Gulab

Singh. Brevet-Major Henry Lawrence was again one of the British signatories. In this Treaty, the British indeed 'made over' to Gulab Singh 'Cashmere' (Kashmir) and 'all the hilly or mountainous country with its dependencies situated to the eastward of the River Indus and the westward of the River Ravi'. The British did so because Gulab Singh had offered to immediately pay two-thirds of a cash indemnity of 'seventy-five lakh' *nanakshahi* (Sikh) rupees that the victorious British had imposed on the defeated Sikhs. (A lakh is one hundred thousand.) Consideration for this sale of real estate therefore amounted to the British being paid Rs 7.5 million.⁴ Pragmatically, this amount was sufficient to meet most of the military costs incurred in their recent war with the Sikhs, with Gulab paying this money in full, via instalments, by 14 March 1850.⁵ Gulab's previous looting of the Sikhs' treasury probably gave him a large amount of the financial wherewithal needed to purchase Kashmir from the British. Whether Gulab had suggested a specific purchase price to the British before the Anglo-Sikh war is not known. However, the fact that the Treaty of Lahore specifically mentioned Gulab Singh one week before he received Kashmir via the Treaty of Amritsar suggests strongly that the British had made some pre-war agreement with Raja Gulab Singh.

As a result of the British sale of Kashmir to Raja Gulab Singh, some important arrangements came into place. The sellers obtained Singh's acknowledgement of the (British) Indian Government's supremacy. This ensured this government's suzerainty, or paramountcy, in matters to do with all Indian princes, including Gulab Singh, particularly in relation to defence, foreign affairs and communications. The sellers also ensured that a—perhaps, the—major figure in Punjab politics was on their side as their military and administrators sought to consolidate still uncertain British power in unstable north-western India. For the purchaser, Gulab Singh received indefeasible (not forfeitable) title to 'Jammu and Kashmir', after which he became Maharaja of this new political creation. Acquiring the Kashmir Valley as part of this deal satisfied Gulab's territorial aspirations. It also added another piece to Gulab's territorial 'tapestry', or mini empire, which, before the Treaty of Amritsar, had comprised Jammu, Ladakh, Baltistan and, supposedly, some or all of the Aksai Chin area in which neither Gulab's administration nor any of his subjects had any actual presence. More importantly, acquiring Kashmir added territory, taxable subjects and real prestige to Gulab's princely state. Prior to acquiring Kashmir, the Jammu area was well known to the Lahore *darbar*. After acquiring Kashmir, the reputation of Gulab's enlarged state of 'Jammu and Kashmir' grew remarkably throughout India. In due course, J&K would become India's largest princely entity and one of its most important, particularly strategically.

A conundrum exists about the British sale of Kashmir to Raja Gulab Singh in 1846: why did the British decide not to directly administer this region themselves? The British could have continued their ownership of Kashmir, but, after one week, they chose otherwise: they sold the region to Gulab Singh for cash. This was despite British influence, power and prestige being such by March 1846 that they were paramount throughout almost the entire Indian subcontinent. Equally, some of these assertive British conquerors comprising military officers and administrators with strong Christian beliefs considered that they had a divinely-ordained 'civilising mission' in Asia (as did their Russian rivals) in which only they could successfully rule places with fairness and virtue. Given the negative impressions that some Britishers held about the devious and self-interested Gulab Singh, Kashmiris would have benefitted more from such British fairness and virtue than from Gulab's harshness. Annexing Kashmir also might have satisfied a mercantile desire to sell British goods in this region and to make some profits for the Company, and for its officials. Making money in Kashmir was possible, given that it had been a reasonably productive and relatively wealthy area under previous exploitative regimes. Administering this region might not have cost the British money; rather, they

might have made money out of it. It therefore would have been worth keeping Kashmir under British control.

There are a number of possible explanations as to why the British chose not to directly rule and administer Kashmir. The most obvious is immediacy: the East India Company simply wanted, or needed, the money it obtained from selling Kashmir to Gulab Singh to meet the heavy costs of its recent military conquest in Punjab, particularly as these costs came so soon after the disastrous, and expensive, Afghanistan campaign. Put simply, the British needed cash. Money was an important consideration for a trading company pursuing profits before possessing property, particularly property that seemingly offered little obvious trade, resources or money-making opportunities. This was a false perception given that Kashmir's revenue made it the second richest province of the Sikh Empire, although the British probably didn't know this at the time. So, a further reason why the British didn't rule Kashmir directly may be that they did not fully know or understand what they were relinquishing. As one Britisher later put it, Kashmir's 'immense value to us was not realised at the time'.⁶ In the 1840s, the British had very limited first-hand knowledge about the remote hilly and mountain country that comprised Kashmir and the regions beyond it that Lawrence initially (mis)named 'the Northern Hills'.⁷ By 1846, few British had ever visited Kashmir and reported about it, chiefly because the region was difficult to access due to its isolation and because of the need to traverse Sikh-controlled territory in order to visit. Even fewer British had journeyed beyond Kashmir to the north, beyond which resided potential British enemies. Indeed, by 1846, Kashmir had experienced visits by very few Europeans. Marco Polo possibly visited around 1277, although this seems unlikely, with his scant accounts more likely based on hearsay. Otherwise, Bernier was the first 'European traveller known to have visited Kashmir', in 1664.⁸ Then followed Forster in 1786; Moorcroft, Trebeck and Guthrie in 1823; Jacquemont in 1831; and Wolff in 1832.⁹ That, apparently, was it. In line with the shortage of European visitors to Kashmir, there was a dearth of published material in English about Kashmir. This compounded the Britishers' lack of knowledge and understanding. Conversely, there were many subcontinentals informed about Kashmir. Apart from Kashmiris, and the British knew very few of them, most of these subcontinentals in 1846 either were from Punjab or were involved with the Sikh Empire. Chief among these was Raja Gulab Singh, who had been to Kashmir a number of times.

Another explanation as to why the British chose not to rule Kashmir directly is that their strong, influential and temporarily invaluable ally, Gulab Singh, may have persuaded the British that, by selling Kashmir to him, this not only would seriously weaken the Sikh Empire, which still had potency, but also that he was best placed to effectively control Kashmir and look after British interests there. Gulab's argument, of course, took no account of the ethnic and religious differences between the Dogra Hindu ruler and his potential subjects, the large majority of whom comprised Kashmiri Muslims. Nevertheless, his existing principality of Jammu did already border the Kashmir Valley in Jammu's north, while he had much experience and influence in the Kashmir region. He and his forces had fought in, quelled rebellions in, and had physically captured, some of the areas that later became J&K, including fighting in Kashmir in 1813–14 and 1819 and in Baltistan in 1841. In 1842, Gulab's army had camped in Kashmiri locations on their way to recapture Ladakh from the Chinese. Few in north-western India could rival Gulab Singh's knowledge, expertise or experience in relation to Kashmir.

Henry Lawrence certainly believed that Gulab Singh was the only person 'with the ability and the means of establishing a strong and beneficial government in the Northern Hills', by which Lawrence

meant the Jammu and the Kashmir regions.¹⁰ Equally, Singh's position possibly resonated with the British who, having obtained Kashmir, did not control the territory of Jammu located between their new possession of Kashmir and their equally new possession of Punjab. After the Treaty of Amritsar, the greater Jammu region remained under Gulab Singh's control. In the event of hostilities with the British, or to put pressure on them, the Jammuited could have used his territory in Jammu and his capable, fresh troops (who had not fought in the Anglo-Sikh war) inimically either against British forces attempting to move into or out of Kashmir and/ or against what would have been their long and vulnerable supply and communication lines to this remote region. Additionally, it seems that the British then had little desire and few resources to spare for a long-term military deployment to, and in, Kashmir, particularly if its residents needed to be pacified and patrolled on an ongoing basis. Best leave this to Gulab Singh. Allowing him to control this region meant that British troops would not be bogged down in the distant and vulnerable Kashmir region. They would be free to be used elsewhere.

Equally important, in 1846, the British were, overall, in a weak physical, tactical and strategic position as they advanced into north-western India, particularly as they had not yet conclusively defeated, nor placated, the powerful Sikhs. Arguably, these vulnerabilities may have been the main reason for the British agreeing to sell Kashmir to Gulab Singh. The war against the Sikhs had been at some cost for the British. The Bengal Army and the Queen's Army had suffered serious losses: 2,415 total casualties, of whom 1,207 were Europeans.¹¹ Additionally, Punjab was still experiencing considerable unrest, instability and governance issues as the Sikh Empire fractured. The East India Company's administration of Punjab was only indirect via its new and imposed Resident in Lahore, Henry Lawrence, who oversaw and guided operations there, not directed them. British armed forces and administrators also were exposed, enduring long and assailable communication and supply lines across British India to distant Calcutta. The existing telegraph line was vulnerable to interdiction. There was no railway to Punjab along which troops, particularly reinforcements, and military materiel could be moved quickly, with railway lines only just starting to appear in India. Similarly, any rail connection to Kashmir would have required the achievement of some major engineering feats that would take considerable time, money and effort to complete. The loss of Kashmir (and Jammu) certainly weakened the Sikh Empire, and showed that they had been weakened. However, the Khalsa Dal was still a potent force. The British realised that, until the Sikhs were finally and fully placated in Punjab, they would need the support, or at least not the antipathy, of Gulab Singh, a man who had been, and still was, highly influential in the Sikh Empire, despite his treachery. Gulab was a powerful person in a powerful position. At that stage, for the British, controlling Punjab, which offered significant revenue possibilities, was more appealing and pressing than directly administering remote Kashmir. These factors engaged British minds more than controlling Kashmir.

Finally, in 1846, British wariness of further military activity a long way from their heartland was still high after their disastrous experiences between 1839–41 in Afghanistan. The British had been largely ignorant about this nation before they invaded it in 1839, as also they were about Kashmir in 1846. They had to cross another ruler's territory to get to Afghanistan, as they would have to do to get to Kashmir. Equally, the British were not focused on Kashmir and unknown northern parts of J&K as potential invasion points to India. They also did not want to administer, garrison and possibly defend vulnerable and remote territory and borders in an area that might become an economic liability. Similarly, they may not have wanted to antagonise China and Russia, which had their own serious concerns about the ever expanding British Empire. The British first needed to placate and control Punjab. To resolve their situation, they accepted their need for a local force able to administer Kashmir. Hopefully this force would comprise Hindus, whom the British then generally favoured

over Muslims. Therefore, with the hot season establishing itself at Lahore—but not realising that Kashmir would be comfortably cooler—the mercantile British transacted with Raja Gulab Singh. Once Kashmir was sold to the Jammuited, the British would never be able to retrieve this territory.

Conversely, of course, no one in 1846 was prescient. The British then were ‘hastening slowly’ into north-western India. Had they known that they would soon fight, and again defeat, the Sikhs in 1849, this time conclusively, they may have annexed Kashmir and ruled it directly. That said, during the second British war against the Sikhs in 1849, the British again were greatly aided because the still-influential Gulab Singh initially remained neutral. He could have been a major problem for the British had he and his troops opposed them. Singh then supported the British after they demanded his active cooperation, as per his obligations under the Treaty of Amritsar, particularly Article 6. If the military position of the British was still uncertain in 1849, then it was even more uncertain in 1846. Thus, three chief factors suggest why the British decided to not rule Kashmir directly in 1846: their need for money; their vulnerability; and, the standing and potential spoiling power of Gulab Singh.

The British in India and the greater region after 1846

Before discussing the consolidation of J&K after its creation in 1846, it is worth briefly assessing both the greater British geo-strategic situation and their administration in India after 1846. It is into this situation that a new J&K, that was far from fully consolidated, fits. By 1849, the British were the ascendant power throughout India. They had defeated all opponents, except the Afghans. After winning the second Anglo-Sikh war in 1849, the victors incorporated Punjab into British India and administered this region directly. Thereafter, placated Sikhs, along with Punjabis in general, became strong British allies, particularly as soldiers serving in the Indian Army. Throughout the rest of India, the British were ruling directly through their own administrators or indirectly through treaties with rulers of princely states, such as they had just concluded with Gulab Singh. The Afghans and, to a lesser extent, the Russians had faded into the geo-strategic background, although the latter would re-emerge.

Whether the East India Company actually sought its pre-eminent position in the Indian subcontinent is a moot point. However, one interesting aspect of the British achievement is that it was basically a British ‘second XI’ who secured their nation’s paramountcy throughout India: service in the subcontinent was not always the first or most popular choice of many capable or ambitious Britons.¹² This makes the British achievement even more extraordinary. British domination in India was different from other British colonies. Compared with India, many other colonies were lightly populated by more itinerant, often less agriculturally-capable, indigenous populations, or natives/aborigines, whom white colonisers physically and militarily eclipsed and often decimated. Conversely, the Indian subcontinent comprised a considerably larger population of diverse, disparate and dispersed ‘natives’ who largely were settled, non-transient, and active agriculturally, but whose disunity made it possible for the British to divide and rule them. These differences seemingly made it easier for London to later grant dominion status to ‘white’ colonies such as Canada (1867),¹³ Australia (1901) and New Zealand (1907) than to ‘non-white’ India. Equally, the differences meant that the British had a more difficult job administering and controlling the more numerous Indians whose loyalty could not always be taken for granted.

British rule in India was not always an easy or an unchallenged affair. In 1856, ten years after the Treaty of Amritsar had created J&K, the East India Company annexed and took direct control of the rich princely state of Oudh (Awadh), centred around Lucknow, because of the ruler’s alleged

misgovernment. While the Company supposedly was still under nominal Mughal rule and, equally supposedly, still did not want to rule India directly, this acquisition essentially completed the Company's control of the subcontinent. Conversely and almost concurrently, however, some British arrogance, intrusiveness and insensitive practices caused serious disenchantment and unease among a large number of Indians. One practice included the aggressive 'Doctrine of Lapse' by which the British directly took over princely estates where the ruler was deemed to be incompetent or was 'without issue': he had no son to enable primogenital succession. (Almost all rulers were men.) Another practice was an order, alleged or actual, given to sepoys to use religiously polluting or distasteful animal fat, including beef or pork, to grease rifle cartridges. Whether true or not, this issue agitated many Indians.

The culmination of various Indians' unease occurred from May 1857 to around June 1858 when the violent and tumultuous Indian Mutiny, also called the Great Revolt/ Indian Uprising/Sepoy Mutiny/Sepoy Rebellion, took place. Indians call it the 'First War of Independence', although there has never been a second such 'war'. During this serious challenge to British rule, awful acts of violence were committed and the Company almost lost its Indian Empire. It 'cost a full year's worth of Indian revenue to win',¹⁴ which was a significant amount for a mercantile outfit. While the British were largely responsible for the causes of the uprising, some of them (falsely) believed that the Mutiny was due to mischievous meddling by a 'foreign hand': Russian or Persian agents manipulating disgruntled Indians. After some bitter and brutal fighting, followed by some bloodthirsty revenge, the British successfully and vengefully re-established their rule in India. One result was that London passed the 'Act for the Better Government of India' in 1858, or the 'India Act', which totally sidelined the East India Company. Instead, London usurped all of the Company's remaining rights and responsibilities in India and administered this entity directly. This included taking over all treaties with Indian princes. The aim was to provide better governance in India and to appease disgruntled Indians.

From 1858, therefore, the British essentially controlled the Indian subcontinent. The paramount power proposed to its partner princes that they practice some partially enlightened paternalism over their patrons. This included the then ruler of J&K, Maharaja Ranbir Singh (ruled 1857–85), who had supported the British during the Mutiny, albeit, like many Indian princes, not necessarily from the outset, nor necessarily forthrightly. For Ranbir, distance from Delhi was a factor, with communications to Jammu being poor, although, given the seriousness of this uprising, it is hard to imagine that news of this major event had not reached Ranbir before he finally committed troops in August 1857 to help the embattled British. Ranbir may have been practising family traits of opportunism and stalling. Equally, in his defence, he was a new ruler, having become Maharaja of J&K in February 1856 when Maharaja Gulab Singh installed him on the throne. Ranbir's rise was fortuitous as both of his elder brothers had pre-deceased him: Randhir (or Udham) in an accident in Lahore in 1840; Sohan while very young.¹⁵ Ranbir had gained some administrative experience before ascending the *gaddi* (throne), having served as Governor of Jammu. Thereafter, Gulab served in the 'subordinate' position of Governor of Kashmir, although he was really still in charge of J&K.

Gulab Singh apparently instigated this change of ruler in J&K because he was concerned about the aggressive and unpopular policies of the Governor-General, Dalhousie, which, in part, provoked the Indian Mutiny, particularly the Doctrine of Lapse. Gulab did have a direct and legitimate heir, Ranbir, although he was his third-born son, not his eldest, who was deceased. Gulab apparently also had two illegitimate sons, Jamiat and Chiman, whose fates are obscure. It is not known if he had any daughters. For a time, Ranbir's uncle, Suchet Singh, had adopted him. However, Suchet died in 1844,

the year after Ranbir, as an eleven-year old, was married.¹⁶ By February 1856, in the twilight of his life, Gulab Singh was concerned that the British might deem him incompetent to rule and that they might take direct control of J&K, as they had done with Oudh and as some regretful British had wanted to do with J&K since they had sold Kashmir to Gulab in 1846. Gulab therefore abdicated and placed Ranbir on the throne. His aim was to ensure that a Dogra continued to rule J&K. Post-Mutiny, the chastened British gave Ranbir the right to adopt an heir from a collateral branch of the Dogra dynasty, should he need or choose to do so. Interestingly, they later denied this right to Ranbir's son and heir, Pratap (sometimes also called Partab), who was Maharaja of J&K from 1885–1925. Had the British not done so, Dogras from Poonch, not Jammu, would have ruled J&K.

Gulab Singh died in August 1857, shortly after the Mutiny began. Ranbir then became J&K's undisputed ruler. From the outset of this significant anti-British action, Gulab had been pro-British. He prevented mutineers from entering J&K and gaining sanctuary or asylum there. He advanced a million rupees to the Punjab Government to pay the unpaid salaries of its troops, and thus placate them. He did not join the anti-British revolt. These acts, plus the fact that Gulab still had a 'profound moral effect on the Punjaub [sic]', helped to ensure that Punjabi soldiers were, at best, pro-British and, at worst, neutral.¹⁷ Indeed, with British troops at Lahore, Multan and Peshawar 'sorely tried in holding the country', had Gulab turned against them in 1857, the British believed that 'his ability, his prestige, his experience, would have produced a great reaction' against them, 'to say nothing of the material means at his disposal'.¹⁸ Soon after Gulab's death and despite Ranbir's inexperience or personal ambivalence, the new ruler of J&K sent a force of 2,000 soldiers, 200 cavalry and six guns to assist the beleaguered British in Delhi.¹⁹ For this supportive gesture, Ranbir later was given a knighthood. He declined further rewards because, as he saw it, he had 'assisted the British as a friend, and not as a mercenary'.²⁰ Even so, after having successfully defeated the mutineers and despite Ranbir's support during this upheaval, the British were still nervous about Russian expansionism and thus sought to tie J&K's rulers closer to their administration. This was not always done amicably, or successfully, with the British unable to dominate Ranbir like they later would suppress Pratap Singh. One reason was the British sense of obligation to Ranbir for his support during the Mutiny. Another was that the Dogras were still influential in and around Punjab. A third was that the British were 'treading warily' as they consolidated their administration after the Mutiny.

Post-Mutiny, the British Crown, via the Government of India, ruled its Indian domain in two ways. The first was via areas that British administrators administered directly, which was known as 'British India'. This comprised roughly two-thirds of the subcontinent; it was divided into various presidencies and provinces. The second was via areas that local princes and native chiefs ruled under British oversight, which was called 'Princely India'. This comprised roughly one-third of the subcontinent, but only about 20 per cent of its population. This bifurcated arrangement was geographically messy, making the subcontinent's political construction of direct and indirect rule resemble a patchwork quilt. The Government of India was based in Calcutta until 1931, after which New Delhi, which was geographically more central, became the capital. With London distant from Calcutta or New Delhi, British officials operated fairly autonomously. Through the Foreign and Political Department (or Political Department; later called the Indian Political Service), they controlled the external relations for each princely state. This meant that each prince, or sovereign, did not have—or should not have—actual relations with 'foreigners'. The Political Department, staffed almost exclusively by British officers, had a reputation for being slow moving, conservative and very pro-British. Only in 1947, when the British withdrawal from India was imminent, did the Political

Department start actively supporting its Indian constituents. It then became pro-princes.

British India and Princely India related to their respective peoples and futures, and to the British, in different ways, with the former 'advancing towards democracy and the other mired in personal autocracy'.²¹ In British India, British officers directly ruled Indians. These administrators were responsible for revenue collection, maintaining law and order, and dispensing justice. Ultimately, the British allowed political parties to form in these areas and, eventually, to administer them. In Princely India, princes, including the ruler of J&K, generally ruled their states autocratically and conservatively. They were free to raise taxes and to levy lucrative import-export duties. They passed laws to govern, administer and control their domains and subjects, with many 'encouraging' the latter to be apolitical. Each ruler dealt with the Crown Representative, the Viceroy, who was the highest representative of the British Crown, and with whom the rulers had made their respective treaties. Invariably, this arrangement involved the Political Department stationing a senior officer in each major princely domain. Known as the British Agent or Resident, he was to report to the Viceroy, as well as to give 'advice' to each ruler. Such guidance was usually binding on the prince.

Post-Mutiny, London also installed a Secretary of State for India who, as a cabinet minister based in London, administered the 'British Raj' (British rule in/ of India). He did so chiefly via the Governor-General for British India and via the Viceroy for Princely India. The same senior British official always served in both paramount positions, although often he was referred to as the Viceroy. He was located in India. The princes had no formal relationship with the Governor-General; their relationship was always directly with the British Crown via the Viceroy and his Residents. The other major figure in the Indian administration was the Commander-in-Chief of the Indian Army. He sat on the Viceroy's Executive Council and was the only official who could rival or challenge the senior most British official in India, as Lord Curzon, the Viceroy, found to his detriment with Lord Kitchener, the Commander-in-Chief in India, in 1905. In 1877, British officials also proclaimed Queen Victoria to be 'Empress of India' at a special *darbar* ceremony held in Delhi. This put the seal on perceived British greatness in, and over, India. This period under Queen Victoria from 1877 to 1901 was, arguably, the high point of the British Empire in India, the creation of which empire some Britishers believed was Great Britain's destiny.

An important effect of the Indian Mutiny of 1857–58 was that it suggested that the British were vulnerable in India. British military prowess had again been seriously challenged. Other great powers believed that Indians, seething with discontent, offered a potential 'fifth column' that would support an invasion. The Russians, particularly, were excited; the British, patently, were nervous. The Russians, smarting from losing the Crimean War in 1856 against France, Britain and the Ottoman Empire, and with a new Tsar, Alexander II, were wanting to expand into Asia beyond Siberia, especially into the maritime Far East and into western Turkestan. They soon obtained some eastern regions via 'unequal treaties' imposed on the weak Chinese in 1858 and 1860. Concurrently, Russia obtained trade concessions in Turkestan and the right to establish consulates in Kashgar and Mongolia. The Crimean War also motivated the Persians to attempt to re-take Herat in 1856. They failed after a British force, complete with potent naval power, defeated them in April 1857, just prior to the Indian Mutiny. The Persians, via a treaty with the British, then renounced their claims to Herat and agreed not to interfere in Afghanistan. Fortuitously, the British concurrently signed a treaty of friendship with the Afghan Amir that kept the Afghans out of the Mutiny. As a reward, the British ambivalently allowed Dost Mohammad Khan to add Herat to his state in 1863, although he died a few days after doing so. While the British faced challenges on land, their position at sea was almost unassailable. The powerful Royal Navy ensured Britain's control of the Indian Ocean and its littoral

states, including Persia. This control was enhanced by British oversight of strategic chokepoints into, and in, the Indian Ocean via colonies such as the Cape Colony (which became part of South Africa in 1910), Aden, Singapore, Seychelles, Mauritius, the Andaman and Nicobar Islands, and Western Australia. This essentially made the Indian Ocean a British-controlled 'lake'.

In the Asian continent, however, the British had a strong rival: Russia. St Petersburg sought to enter Turkestan because of limited territorial opportunities to Russia's south-west after the Crimean War. The 1856 (peace) Treaty of Paris that dealt with the post-war 'Eastern Question'—the future of the Ottoman Empire—agreed to respect this empire's independence and territorial integrity and to demilitarise the (formerly Russian-controlled) Black Sea. In terms of territorial expansion, this forced Russia to focus on its south-east, which St Petersburg increasingly did. While the Russians were seeking territory, including possibly a warm-water port to ease their maritime vulnerabilities, opportunities for trade and to acquire raw materials were also attractive. This included securing much-needed cotton unavailable because of the American Civil War (1861–65). Russian imperial expansion also involved the Russians' 'civilising mission' of spreading Russo-Christian enlightenment and (relatively) liberal views among savage Muslim tribes and central Asian potentates. Russia also wanted to stop despots, particularly in western Turkestan, from enslaving and selling Russians, and to liberate Russians already enslaved. Captain Nikolai Muraviev, the first Russian envoy to Khiva in 1819, discovered over 3,000 enslaved Russians, plus 30,000 enslaved Persians and Kurds. He later pleaded the Russians' case to Tsar Alexander. Nevertheless, Russia's anti-slavery stance perplexed some Central Asians, particularly given that many Russian landlords still owned serfs, a practice that only ended in 1861. A final reason for the Russians to enter Turkestan was to prevent the British from doing so. They believed that British 'agents' were becoming active in Central Asia, which St Petersburg perceived to be Russia's exclusive area of influence. Conversely, the British feared that the Russians wanted to enter Afghanistan and eastern Turkestan/China's Sinkiang region to India's detriment. Each empire was nervous about the other's activities, although they either didn't know this or they chose to ignore it.

From 1858, Russians increasingly entered western Turkestan/Central Asia to look for trade opportunities, to acquire intelligence, and to deny the British. In 1858, they sent a major mission to Khiva and Bukhara. In 1865, Russia's first large-scale, sustainable military move into western Turkestan occurred when the Tsar's forces conquered Tashkent, an important trading town strategically located between Kokand (now Qo'qon, Uzbekistan) and Bukhara that was wealthy due to capable merchants and abundant natural resources. Tashkent was then part of the Kokand khanate, with Kokand town itself located some 100 miles to Tashkent's south-east. This Russian action was the 'thin edge' of the khanate 'wedge' that Russia militarily and commercially thereafter pushed deep into Central Asia. Although the Russians pretended to all that they weren't expansionist, post-Tashkent, their forces continued to slowly advance into western Turkestan. This slowness chiefly was not to alarm or excessively upset the watching and wary British, whom the Russians believed desired to stem Russia's expansion and capture Central Asia's spoils themselves. Equally, the Russians confronted difficult terrain, the harsh dry climate, long and exposed supply lines, and hostility from khanate forces and tribesmen, particularly marauding Turkomen who regularly plundered and attacked them and who were the major suppliers of slaves to the khanates. Nevertheless, by the mid-1880s, Russia was in control of all of western Turkestan. Like the British, they had played a clever game of 'hastening slowly' as they captured territory. There was little that the remote British could do, or chose to do. Until the 1880s, there was sufficient distance between the two empires.

Compared with extending Russian control into the difficult Caucasus, expanding into Turkestan

was far less troublesome for the Russians. The khans sought to resist. However, they and their subjects were nowhere near as rugged or dogged in their resistance as the hostile and intransigent Muslim Circassians and Daghestanis in the Caucasus whom the Russians took decades to suppress. In western Turkestan, once the Russian military's forces, logistics and tactics were organised, they inevitably and fairly quickly conquered, then subsumed, the three Muslim khanates. The first to fall was the Mangit dynasty in Bukhara in 1868. Regarded as the holiest city in Turkestan, Bukhara became a Russian protectorate the year after the equally expansive British stationed a commercial agent in Ladakh. Next to fall was the Qungrat dynasty in Khiva in 1873. This gain enabled the Russians to free some 40,000 slaves and to obtain control over river transport on the lower Oxus River. Last to fall was the (Uzbek) Ming dynasty in Kokand in 1876,²² which region was renamed Fergana. This brought the Russians to about 200 miles from Kashgar in eastern Chinese Turkestan. These gains somewhat secured the Russian Empire's southern borders, although there was still much uncertainty about these borders due to instability in Persia and western China and due to the threat to Russia of the British and their forces, who were re-thinking their policy of masterly inactivity. The Russians were keen to push south but were wary lest they excessively provoked the British. The khanates of western Turkestan that the Russians captured, although remote from St Petersburg, would remain under heavy Russian, then later Soviet, influence and control for just over a century.

Russia's integration of the western Turkestan khanates and nearby territory into its empire was complete by about the mid-1880s, when Russia captured and added the Trans-Caspian region to Turkestan. This region comprised territory east of the Caspian Sea, north of Iran and Afghanistan, and south-west of Khiva and Bukhara. Nominally, the 'region' had been under the control of the rulers of Khiva or Bukhara, or of Iran. Russia's acquisition of this region and its consolidation of Western Turkestan followed Britain's consolidation of its Indian Empire, as publically marked by Queen Victoria's elevation to Empress of India in 1877. Russia's control of these lands meant that about 500 miles now separated the British Empire in India and the Russian Empire in Turkestan. While this was a long way for people hailing from the small island of Great Britain and despite poor or non-existent land routes, this distance was insufficient to ease British anxiety, particularly of those Britishers posted to distant locations in the large Indian Empire. Furthermore, in the event of any land warfare with Russia, the Royal Navy's significant maritime capabilities would be largely useless. British soldiers and administrators posted in the strategic princely state of J&K were particularly uneasy about perceived British vulnerabilities. J&K's northern borders were not far from unstable China, intriguing Tibet, difficult Afghanistan and the Fergana region of Russia's tormentingly-close Turkestan.

Consolidating the princely state

The creation of the princely state of Jammu and Kashmir in 1846 for Raja Gulab Singh meant that a local personage held sway in this most northern part of the Indian subcontinent for the first time since Mughals captured Kashmir in 1586. Gulab Singh was not fully independent; he was under British suzerainty. Nevertheless, his successful ambition to unify the Jammu hills area and to obtain the prestigious Kashmir region reflected his strategic skills and a lust for territory. These possibly were motivated by an unsuccessful attempt by a distant forebear to capture Kashmir in 1779. This forebear was Raja Ranjit Dev of Jammu, Gulab Singh's great grandfather's elder brother, who had stabilised the Jammu region in about 1760 under Mughal suzerainty and whose descendants came under Ranjit Singh's direct control from the early 1800s. Seemingly, Gulab Singh's ascendancy in J&K was a

positive development. Certainly, many Jammuites and the nervous British thought so. For Kashmiris and others, however, he and the later Hindu Dogra rulers were not always warmly welcomed. Indeed, soon after Gulab Singh's acquisition of Kashmir, the British had to help the Jammuited gain control of the troublesome Kashmir region. For strategic reasons, the British thereafter would play a major role consolidating, then maintaining control of, the northern frontier areas of the princely state.

After selling Kashmir to Gulab Singh in 1846, the still uncertain British obtained some physical, strategic and fiduciary relief, albeit temporary. They felt the need to defer to 'their' new and influential ruler who sought to ensure that J&K had as much autonomy as he could secure from the British. Consequently, the British did not impose on Gulab Singh a British Resident who may have overseen his administration and activities and who may have sought to curtail his excesses. Instead, they deputed a seasonal 'Officer on Special Duty in Kashmir' who supposedly was concerned dealing with European visitors to Kashmir and their interests, and who liaised with the Maharaja, and monitored, as much as he could, the ruler's activities. The British may have acquiesced in this arrangement due to a sense of obligation because the Jammuited general significantly had remained neutral in the first Anglo-Sikh War. More importantly, they acquiesced due to Gulab Singh's strong prestige locally, a major factor that the British needed. At that stage, Gulab was an indispensable ally whocould have, if handled poorly, become a huge impediment to the Indian Government. Equally, Gulab may have been able to argue for his position and rights, particularly at time when British vulnerability meant that they had few other options in relation to Kashmir, apart from him. The British only finally imposed a Resident with full powers on J&K following the death of Ranbir Singh in 1885 and the subsequent accession of Pratap Singh. Thereafter, the British enhanced their position in J&K through inducting British officers into the Dogra regime. By 1920, there were nineteen British officials working in various positions in J&K. These included the 'Resident for Kashmir', the 'Special Assistant Resident for Punch [sic; Poonch]', the 'Assistant Resident for Leh and Ladakh', the 'Political Agent, Gilgit', and the 'Assistant Political Agent, Chilas'.²³

While Gulab Singh may have been a capable soldier, he initially confronted problems integrating Kashmir into his newly created princely state. Indeed, Gulab needed British military support to capture and subdue Kashmir. Soon after agreeing the Treaty of Amritsar, the British supportively sent a senior military officer, Captain John Nicholson (later a hero of the 1857 Mutiny), to help the Jammuited ruler modernise and instil European-type discipline in his army. Gulab saw advantage in acquiring knowledge and expertise from the capable and powerful British Indian Army. Nicholson's arrival was fortuitous because, in July 1846, when Gulab and his Jammu Army went to Kashmir to claim his new possession and to impose their will, Kashmiris embarrassingly forced them out. Around 1845, the Sikhs, who had dominated Kashmir and suppressed Kashmiris since 1819, had installed Sheikh Imam-ud-Din as Governor of Kashmir. This Muslim had recently had taken over from his father, Sheikh Ghulam Mohi-ud-Din, a trusted and popular Sikh administrator who re-opened Srinagar's Jama Masjid during his governance from 1841. Both men may have known Gulab Singh from the Jammuited's previous visits to the Kashmir Valley. The somewhat ambitious younger Sheikh, who enjoyed some popular support locally, did not relinquish power easily, at first. His resistance possibly resulted from written instructions sent to him by the Lahore Court. After the Jammu soldiers had fled Kashmir for their lives, the furious British rapidly dispatched a 10,000-strong force from Lahore to Kashmir, which comprised some of the recently defeated Sikhs and Jammu Dogras.²⁴ This involvement of Sikh soldiers began a strong military tradition of active Punjabi support for the British. (After the British defeated the Sikhs, particularly after the second Anglo-Sikh war in 1848–49, capable and martial Punjabi Sikhs, Hindus and Muslims joined the British Indian Army in large

numbers. They served it well. In 1930, Punjabis comprised 54 per cent of the Indian Army's 150,000 troops, a percentage that rose to 62 per cent if one excludes the 19,000 (non-Indian) Nepalese Gurkhas, with whom the Punjabis were (inexplicably) counted.²⁵ A percentage of these Punjabis would have included Poonchi and Mirpuri Muslims from J&K who, unable to enlist in the J&K State Forces, enlisted in the Indian Army in large numbers as 'Punjabi Musalmans' (Muslims), mainly in the Punjab Regiment. J&K had at least 50,000 'Poonchi and Mirpuri returnees from World War II'.²⁶ Someone known to Gulab Singh led these troops: Henry Lawrence, head of the Board of Administration that oversaw British interests in Punjab. Confronting this superior force and with few regular soldiers of his own, Sheikh Imam-ud-Din capitulated and surrendered to the British officer who was acting as the Maharaja's political adviser. Consequently, from around November 1846, Kashmir politically became part of J&K.

After the British helped Gulab Singh secure physical possession of Kashmir and after he had subdued the region with his usual zeal and brutality, the British began to explore and survey the princely state to determine its area, assets, outer limits and how far British paramountcy actually extended. In May 1847, the British and Gulab Singh made some territorial adjustments. They exchanged the rebellious Muslim-dominant Hazara region located west of the Jhelum River in northern Punjab,²⁷ which even Gulab found too difficult to handle, for some former Sikh territory adjoining Jammu's eastern border that Hindus predominantly populated. Thereafter, the Jhelum River on Hazara's eastern edge, from near modern day Muzaffarabad in the north to near Jhelum town in the south, provided a sector of the Anglo-J&K border. Shortly before this exchange of territory, Gulab also tried (unsuccessfully) to obtain control of the neighbouring princely state of Chamba to J&K's east, which then had a minor as ruler and which he had been promised in Article 1 of the Treaty of Amritsar. Gulab was placated by being given Lakhanpur (now in Kathua, eastern Jammu), in return for which Chamba renounced a claim to neighbouring Bhadrawah (Bhadarwah; now a district in eastern Jammu).²⁸ After 1846, Gulab Singh apparently spent much of his time in Kashmir, a region that he knew from past visits and experiences and where he enjoyed living. In 1857, he died there.

By around 1861, Gulab Singh's heir, Maharaja Ranbir Singh, had largely consolidated the territory that came to comprise the princely state of J&K as it existed in 1947. This followed his move in 1860 into J&K's northern extremes, about which the Treaty of Amritsar was vague, to say the least. Ranbir first recaptured and incorporated Gilgit, a town that the Sikhs had occupied for about five years before Gulab Singh nominally obtained it in 1846. The Sikhs had won this area around 1841 after defeating a powerful local ruler, Gaur Rahman from Yasin. Gaur himself had killed the Raja of Gilgit and gained control of much of the territory that later would become the Gilgit Agency. In 1863, Ranbir conquered Yasin, west of Gilgit, although people there were dissatisfied with Dogra rule and revolted in 1886. Despite the Treaty of Amritsar's stipulation, the Jammu ruler obtained Gilgit, even though it was actually located on the western (not eastern) side of the Indus River. His acquisition may have been justified because the Treaty spoke loosely of Maharaja Gulab Singh and his heirs receiving 'all the hilly or mountainous country' (Article 1) and that Singh's territory 'shall not be at any time changed without concurrence of the British Government' (Article 4), which concurrence Ranbir Singh presumably had obtained.²⁹ The British were prepared to allow such advantageous interpretations, chiefly because this did not require them to commit troops to these remote, uncertain and often unsettled areas.

Initially, the Ladakh area was of greater importance to the British than Gilgit, chiefly because they were interested in neighbouring Tibet. From 1867, the British stationed a commercial agent in Leh,

Ladakh's largest and most important town, albeit isolated and remote from distant Calcutta. This agent was to facilitate trade from Leh via two routes. First, via the easterly Chang Lung Pass and, to its north, via the higher Karakoram Pass, with Yarkand in Sinkiang, which was relatively close to Leh. Second, with Tibet, the major population centres of which were very distant from Leh but with which Kashmir had a good trade in fine wool for shawls. Later, a Central Asian Trading Company was formed to facilitate trade with Yarkand via Leh, although it struggled against entrenched Russian commercial interests. Traditionally, the longer and more difficult Leh-Yarkand route from J&K to Sinkiang was preferred to the alternative and shorter Gilgit-Kashgar route, chiefly as travellers and traders were less prone to being robbed. Despite the presence of the British commercial agent in Leh, little additional trade eventuated. Importantly, however, this official oversaw Ladakhi affairs and monitored any intrusive Chinese or Tibetan, and later Russian, movements into the Ladakh region.

After Ranbir Singh obtained possession of the Gilgit area, he and the British sought to gain control of the remote territory between Gilgit and J&K's northern borders. Dogra territorial and financial ambitions and British strategic pragmatism respectively were involved, because this territory had not been under Sikh control, nor was it mentioned in the Treaty of Amritsar. That said, the Treaty did allow both parties to change J&K's boundaries (Article 4), while it compelled the British to protect the Dogras' territories 'from external enemies' (Article 9). For the voracious Dogras, more territory meant more prestige and, even better, additional revenue by taxing more subjects, even though these people were poor. In 1846, an Indian observed about Kashmiris that 'The people are generally very poor owing to the oppressions and extortions of their [Sikh] rulers'.³⁰ While this confirmed the Sikhs' greed, it did not deter subsequent Dogra rulers from also exploiting their poor subjects. Under Dogra rule, the ruler owned all lands. Writing in 1895, Knight observed that the Maharaja governed J&K 'primitively' and used 'grasping official middlemen' to 'plunder the peasant' and fill the state's coffers.³¹ If these financial challenges weren't enough, Kashmiris also, about whom we know the most, had to endure significant natural and other calamities on occasions (as may have other J&K-ites). For example, during a period of twenty-five years in the second half of the nineteenth century, they experienced earthquakes in 1863, 1878 and 1884; famines and starvation in 1864 and 1877; cholera outbreaks in 1857–58, 1867, 1872, 1875–76 and 1879; fires in 1875 and 1878; and major floods in 1877.³² More enlightened rulers helped the people to deal with these calamities by bringing in food, deploying manpower and by giving financial support. Less enlightened rulers left the Kashmiris, and their other subjects, to their own devices.

The efforts of the British and Ranbir Singh to secure the territory between Gilgit and J&K's northern borders meant that J&K was one of the few princely states that expanded in area after the 1857 Mutiny. This increase in area 'was forced upon the Imperial Government by the advancing power of the Russian Empire and the intrigues of its particular officers'.³³ A British need was to define and secure J&K's borders. The British still feared that their imperial opponents might be contemplating invading India. There were three possible invasion routes: via Afghanistan and north-western India; via eastern Persia and western Baluchistan; and, via J&K's (still unknown) northern frontier. This was not a simple equation in which any Russian advance would occur unopposed. Apart from the Indian Army's obvious military capabilities, Britain and Russia competed for influence and collected intelligence on each other in Afghanistan and Persia. Equally, Britain controlled India's north-western frontier region and Baluchistan and it had nominal control of J&K—although not yet the princely state's northern border areas, nor did the British know much about the territory beyond these border areas. Thus, both the British and the Dogra rulers of J&K had good

reasons to intrude into, and to seek to control, the areas around and beyond Gilgit.

Until the late 1880s, neither the British nor the Dogras fully understood what actually comprised, or should comprise, the entire princely state of J&K. The Indian Surveyor-General's Office only completed the first map of J&K in 1861, fifteen years after surveys first began. In 1873, a 'rough enumeration of the people inhabiting the various districts' of J&K was made.³⁴ There appears to have been little else officially undertaken. The 1861 map was titled *Jamoo [sic], Kashmir and Adjacent Districts*. It showed in detail the topography of, and the towns located in, Jammu Province and Kashmir Province, south of Gilgit. It named the various adjacent districts of India to the south-east, south and west of these two provinces. It also named districts to the north and east of Jammu or Kashmir provinces that presumably were located in J&K: Chilas, 'Astor or Hazoora', Dras (Drass), Sooroo, and Zanskar. However, confirming the mapmakers' limited knowledge about areas beyond either Jammu Province or Kashmir Province, the map did not show any details for the regions of Gilgit, Baltistan or Ladakh, nor did it show J&K's international boundaries with Afghanistan and with Tibet and/ or China, which, as we now know, Gilgit, Baltistan and Ladakh abutted. Similarly, the mapmakers showed many numbered, but unnamed, mountains in J&K that were each labelled 'Snowy Peak'.³⁵ Later maps eventually clarified J&K's cartography, topography and borders, although not always to the satisfaction of, or agreement with, India's neighbours, particularly China.

Thus, although the British and the Dogras were seeking to consolidate J&K's northern frontier, they knew little about the geography around Gilgit, except that somewhere to its north and north-east were located troublesome Afghanistan, unstable China and aggressive Russia. This ignorance was not surprising: the second European ever to enter the Gilgit area and record his efforts for the benefit of others only did so in 1866, twenty years after J&K was created. Attempts were made along the way to map northern parts of J&K, although, as noted, the 1861 map of J&K showed no details of Gilgit, Baltistan or Ladakh. An 1872 map was slightly better informed: it showed Gilgit, but no towns north of it. The map also speculated that J&K's north-eastern border was well beyond both the Karakoram Pass and Khotan, Sinkiang, which was on the southern edge of the Taklamakan Desert, while it was unclear about where the Afghanistan-J&K border ran.³⁶ An 1875 map of *Turkestan and the Countries Between the British and Russians Dominions in Asia* was not much clearer.³⁷ 'Mapped on the basis of the Surveys made by British and Russian Officers up to 1875', it (correctly) showed Gilgit, 'Baltistan or Little Tibet', Bunji and Astor as part of J&K. Conversely, it showed Aksai Chin as part of 'Chinese Tibet'—not as part of J&K, as India would later claim—and it showed Hunza, Nagar and Yasin as not being part of J&K, which they would later become. Similarly, it showed Dir not as part of British India, as it would later become as part of Punjab's Frontier Districts (later NWFP). Similarly, according to the 1890 *Gazetteer of Kashmir and Ladak [sic]*, J&K then only comprised two provinces: 'Jamu' and Kashmir, each of which was administered by a governor. 'The districts of Baltistan or Skardu and Ladak [sic] [we]re included in the province of Jamu [sic]; and the district of Gilgit, including Astor, in Kashmir. The territory of Punch [sic] [wa]s administered by Raja Moti Singh [son of Dhyan Singh] ... under a grant from the Maharaja.' Fifteen years later, there was still no mention of places north of Gilgit, such as Hunza, Nagar, Punial, Yasin and Chitral, in the provincial structure of J&K.³⁸

The strategic northern frontier area located north of Gilgit, south of the Afghan border and west of the Chinese border, came under increasing British control. This was particularly so after the Gilgit Agency, 'one of the gates of India',³⁹ was created in 1877, possibly in response to Russia capturing Kokand in 1876. For the then poorly-informed British, this khanate was located 'somewhere to the

north of J&K'. The Gilgit Agency comprised a British Political Agent and some assistants headquartered in Gilgit town. They were supplied from Srinagar, 230 miles away, with re-supply difficult due to road closures each winter. The Gilgit area was rugged. Around Gilgit, four mountain ranges meet in 'very confused topography' creating a complex knot of peaks: from the west, the Hindu Kush Range (meaning 'kills Hindus' or 'Hindu killer'); from the east, the Karakoram Range ('black gravel'); from the north, the Pamirs ('roof of the world'); and, from the south-east, the western Himalaya Range ('abode of snow').⁴⁰ Twelve of the world's twenty-seven highest mountains are located in this area. Six of the eight or nine major passes from southern Central Asia to northern India/J&K were located reasonably close to Gilgit, with some of them found at the end of waterways that flowed through, or near, Gilgit. Although the passes were annually blocked for about six months due to snow and inclement weather and although large armies had never entered India using these passes, the British believed that some of them offered possibilities for intrusion by light mobile forces, or even troops with artillery. The passes therefore needed to be monitored, particularly the Ishkuman Pass some 60 miles north of Gilgit 'as the crow flies' and the Baroghil and Darkot passes about 40 miles west of Ishkuman Pass. Such seemingly short distances discounted the difficult mountainous terrain, intermittent landslides and hostile climate that any invading force would need to endure before they got anywhere near confronting entrenched, capable, disciplined, and fresher, British defenders. Nevertheless, the Gilgit area was the key to J&K's important northern frontier.

The acquisition of Gilgit itself began a slow shift of British focus away from singular curiosity about the reclusive and difficult-to-access entity of lama-dominated Tibet towards the far western Muslim-dominant region of Sinkiang ('the new dominion or frontier'), immediately north of Tibet. Apart from the usual British strategic concern about colliding empires—Russian, British and now neighbouring Chinese—potential trade was also a lure. China was the nearby, but increasingly unstable, power nominally in charge of Sinkiang. In 1877, Peking (now Beijing) gave this name to the eastern Turkestan region once called 'Buchar' and considered to be part of Chinese Tartary. They did so after returning Sinkiang to traditional Chinese control following a fifteen-year rebellion led by Yaqub Beg, a Tajik originally from Kokand. Beg had called his domain 'Kashgaria' as it was based around the town of Kashgar, in south-western Sinkiang. Beyond Sinkiang's north lay Mongolia, which traditionally was politically close to Tibet, and Russia, which sought influence in and over Sinkiang and was concerned about Mongolia, chiefly because invading Mongols in the thirteenth century had brutally imposed the so-called 'Tatar Yoke' that Russians had endured for over two centuries. South of Sinkiang was Tibet, which had an increasingly subordinate relationship with China but whose residents may have liked to have been diplomatically closer to Russia, which they perceived to be on the rise in Asia.

Into these imperial entanglements, the British entered. They previously may have encouraged Yaqub Beg to control Sinkiang, partly to further weaken China. More likely, the British hoped that the Muslim would create a state that could impede Christian Russia's almost inevitable south-eastwards progress through Muslim areas of Central Asia towards India, or which could act as a buffer state between Russia and India, or which perhaps could even pro-actively attack the Russians and reverse their expansion. Trade was another British consideration, with Kashgaria amenable to exports of Indian tea and British goods. To enhance his own political longevity, Beg tried to play Russia off against Britain. While this alienated China, Beg's territory ultimately returned to Chinese control in 1877 after he died. This reunification made the position of the British in Sinkiang harder, chiefly as the Chinese perceived (correctly) that the British had encouraged Beg's secessionist activities in the first place.

Like Gilgit, few British had ever visited Sinkiang. Therefore, before engaging with this Chinese province, the British needed to shore up their own boundaries. They needed to determine where greater Gilgit's internal boundaries, international borders and strategic passes lay. No one knew, let alone had mutually delimited (agreed by treaty) and demarcated (marked the agreed border on the ground) international borders in this remote and rugged area of north-eastern J&K/south-western China/far-eastern Afghanistan. Nor did some people, such as the Chinese and the Tibetans, necessarily want or need to employ such clinical, European-inspired border devices. Approximate borders enabled flexibility and lessened the likelihood of conflicts. Conversely, British precision demanded a clear and defensible northern frontier: 'A vacuum was a threat, defence was the priority, and demarcation the ultimate aim'.⁴¹ Furthermore, if China or Russia attacked J&K, it would be British and Indian forces, not J&K forces, that necessarily would bear the brunt of the fighting. A Chinese attack from Sinkiang seemed unlikely in the 1860s, especially as this region was then under the control of the reasonably pro-British Yaqub Beg. More seriously, the British needed to determine what Russia was doing, or might do, in and around this distant and strategically important frontier area at the northern extreme of Britain's very large and disparate Indian empire.

Although the British established the strategic Gilgit Agency in 1877, they left it in 1881. By this time, they considered the area consolidated and the nearby geo-strategic region 'perfectly tranquil'.⁴² More pointedly, the Gilgit Agency was remote, expensive to run, and the intelligence it provided was poor. Equally, the British were distracted by their second war with Afghanistan from 1878–80, while the 1878 Congress of Berlin had temporarily stemmed Russian assertiveness in Turkestan. J&K State Forces were left to protect the Gilgit area. By 1889, times had changed. In 1882, the Russians, as a result of the St Petersburg Treaty between China and Russia, had established a consulate in Kashgar, the closest major town in Chinese Sinkiang to J&K; in 1885, the possibly pro-Russian, Maharaja Pratap Singh, had ascended the J&K throne; also in 1885, some serious Russian aggression, known as the Panjdeh Incident, had occurred in the Oxus River area; in 1886, people in Yasin had revolted; in 1888, Russians had been sighted in the greater Gilgit area. For strategic reasons, Calcutta decided to re-establish the Gilgit Agency, which eventuated in August 1889. This politico-military entity located 400 miles from the nearest British cantonment of Rawalpindi and accessible only in warmer months became of great importance in British-Dogra relations. Indeed, because of its importance, the British stationed a Political Agent in the Agency. The first of the re-instated Political Agents was Colonel Algernon Durand. He saw his role as a 'constant struggle to raise a stretch of Frontier 300 miles in length from a condition of incessant war, anarchy, and oppression, into a state of fairly established peace, prosperity and good governance'. More pointedly, Durand needed to oversee and monitor the important and sensitive northern frontier located somewhere 'south of that portion of the Himalayan range which divides China and Russian Turkestan and Eastern Afghanistan from the Indian Empire' and known officially as 'the region of the Eastern Hindu-Kush'.⁴³ China was unstable; Russia was expanding; a surly Afghanistan again disliked the British and possibly liked the Russians. While all three entities posed diplomatic challenges, Russia was the greatest threat to British India. It was politically stable, militarily and (relatively) economically strong, and assertive. According to Durand, Russia's advance to Afghanistan and in Central Asia required the British to 'strengthen' their 'line of defence', in particular the 'northern passes of the Hindu-Kush, which afford a difficult but not impracticable route for a force large enough to cause excitement, if nothing worse, in Kashmir'.⁴⁴ Indeed, in the event of a Russian-British war, there was 'absolutely nothing to prevent a Russian officer, with a thousand Cossacks', from outflanking the British and 'reaching Astor in 10 days after

crossing the passes of the Hindu-Kush, and from watering his horses in the Woolar [Wular] Lake four days later'.⁴⁵ For the apprehensive British, this was a sobering thought. Wular Lake was less than 30 miles from Srinagar.

By the time the Gilgit Agency was re-instituted in 1889, the British had also become concerned about Russia's movement into eastern Turkestan, with Russian expansion 'a very real and rapidly approaching menace in the last quarter of the 19th Century'.⁴⁶ In particular, the British were concerned about the Kashgar region in southern Sinkiang. Russia had its new consulate in Kashgar, a remote town 800 miles from the provincial capital of Urumchi (Urumqi). To the east, Peking and mainland China were even more distant and difficult to access as travellers had to negotiate the harsh Taklamakan Desert. Kashgar became even more remote when southern Nanjing became China's capital after Sun Yat Sen's revolution ended the Qing/Manchu dynasty in 1911. Because getting goods or communications to Kashgar from Peking was arduous, supplies generally were moved to Kashgar via western (Russian) Turkestan, not via eastern Turkestan/Sinkiang. This long-established trade and communication route involved goods being shipped from Chinese ports to the distant Black Sea, then being taken overland across the Caucasus to the Caspian Sea, then over this sea, then overland through southern Central Asia—including by Russian railways from the 1890s—and then over the Pamir Mountains using animals. Eventually, Russia became so important in Kashgar that the rouble became the major unit of currency and trade there. The British disliked Russia's strong influence in Sinkiang. Their greater fear, however, was that Russia could utilise the well-established Russia-Kashgar transport route as an invasion route into India, via J&K.

The Kashgar region became even more important in Russian and British strategic thinking after Russia annexed Kokand in 1876. This acquisition extended Russia's territory and strategic reach to the Pamir Mountains area in the rugged far south-east of western Turkestan. Possibly, it included the Taghdumbash Pamir located north of Hunza, itself J&K's most northern region. The way some Russians saw it, 'As Kokand now belonged to Russia, the Pamirs were also Russian.'⁴⁷ The next logical step was for the Russians to annex Sinkiang. The issue was not that simple as there were a number of 'pamirs'—flat plateaus or U-shaped valleys surrounded by mountains—in the Pamir Mountains. The most important of these in relation to Russia-India relations were, from west to east, the Great Pamir around Lake Victoria (now Lake Zorkul, between Afghanistan and Tajikistan), the Little Pamir at the eastern end of the Wakhan Corridor, and, to its east, the Taghdumbash Pamir, east of which lay the Silk Route from Kashgar, via Gilgit, to the Indian subcontinent. The British did not want Russia to annex Kashgaria as this would have brought the Russians closer to Tibet, south of Kashgar, over which mysterious region the British themselves wanted to assert their influence. Interestingly, while the British feared a Russian invasion of India via Kashgaria and J&K, the Russians were equally concerned about a British invasion of western Turkestan across the Pamirs. Neither power seemed prepared to acknowledge that, because of the difficult terrain, bitter weather and remoteness, any such undertaking would have been exceedingly difficult. One British move that calmed the Russians somewhat was Britain's imposition of a border on Afghanistan in 1894 as this created a buffer state between both empires. The concept of 'bufferistan' worked well for both players in the Great Game/Tournament of Shadows, it seems.

British fears of malevolent Russian intentions were almost certainly excessive. For Russian troops to invade J&K, they would need to traverse over, or around, the Pamirs. No force had ever used this difficult route, in which the 'bottle-neck' passes were easily defensible, to invade India.⁴⁸ Traditionally, invasions of India were via Afghanistan. Similarly, to annex Kashgaria, Russia would

need to expend significant resources. Either or both campaigns would have required St Petersburg to institute significant supply and communication lines to each region for potentially little in return, plus the possibility of seriously antagonising Britain and China. Francis Younghusband, a British military officer who had trekked across China, including via Chinese Turkestan, in 1886–87 and then was involved exploring the Pamirs from 1889, reported to the Indian Government that a Russian invasion of J&K was unlikely. He believed that, due to long supply lines—the closest Russian garrison was at Osh, 400 miles away in the Fergana Valley—and associated transport difficulties and logistical vulnerabilities, the Russian Army could only move and sustain about 1,000 men to a location near Gilgit. Only about half of these soldiers would then—weather and their health permitting—be available to actually attack Gilgit. British forces would oppose any such attack. Equally, in relation to annexing Kashgaria, it appeared that Russia, which had far more leverage with China in Sinkiang than Britain, was more interested in exploiting this region and its disparate people, not in annexing it. Russia's interests were mainly commercial, although the levels of trade with Kashgaria were far less than what the Russians (or the British) had hoped for. A further interest was strategic: the Russians were satisfied that the continuing threat of their expansion kept British strategic planners in India anxious and pre-occupied. Almost certainly, however, St Petersburg was more interested in capturing Constantinople than Kashgar.

Strategically, Russia had done well. Bukhara was an important gain that ultimately reduced both Afghanistan's size and its influence via feudatories, which in the 1800s extended Afghanistan's borders further north than its current borders. Kokand was a significant gain as it was adjacent to British-controlled J&K and to Chinese Turkestan. Importantly, Kokand had long-established and profitable trade relations with eastern Turkestan, especially with Kashgar located further east on the Silk Route. Furthermore, Kokand claimed some vague territorial rights over Kashgaria, where it had some influence because of Kashgar's fellow Muslim population and because of trade, but sometimes where it also had an adversarial political relationship with China. The Russians sought to maintain the Kokandis' supposed territorial rights, as a result of which they were able to ensure that Russia had strong influence in Kashgaria and its affairs, particularly in relation to trade. The Russians' chief mechanism for maintaining such influence was via its official consul in Kashgar. Russian officers, supported by some Cossacks, staffed this consul. Despite Russian successes, there was still much uncertainty about where the borders between Kokand, J&K and Kashgaria were located, or should be located.

The alarming closeness of the Russians in the relatively unknown Pamirs area and the lack of distinct borders to the north of J&K were brought home to the British by some Russian sabre-rattling from the 1870s. During the 1877–78 Russo-Turkish war, the Russians extended their empire into territory once held by the weakening Ottoman Empire. Indeed, Russia might have captured the iconic Constantinople but for the powerful and deterrent presence of the Royal Navy. Concurrently, the Russian Army apparently also moved troops into passes in the Wakhan and Chitral areas located respectively to the north and north-west of J&K. Indeed, the Russians may have been assembling a force of 30,000 soldiers near Tashkent that could strike India via Afghanistan in the event of a Russo-British war, which appeared likely at the time. The Congress of Berlin in July 1878 resolved the issue of which European powers should have which Ottoman territories, although not to Russia's total satisfaction. Piqued, the Russians sent a mission to Kabul in August 1878 in order to compel the Afghan ruler, Sher Ali, to sign a treaty with Russia and, concurrently, to prevent any British missions into his nation. Raising British angst, Ali reluctantly agreed to the treaty in September 1878. The Afghan ruler now found himself sandwiched between opportunistic Russians and aggressive

Britishers: Afghanistan had become the 'ball' in the Anglo-Russian Great Game. The indignant British issued an ultimatum to him to apologise and to accept certain British conditions or else he would be considered an enemy. Ali was given twenty-one days to comply. He failed, or chose not, to do so.

The second British-Afghan War followed soon after Sher Ali farewelled the visiting Russians. Startled, the Afghan ruler watched in late November 1878 as a 35,000-strong British force invaded Afghanistan in three places to shore up the British Indian Empire's strategic position. (Maharaja Ranbir Singh may have offered J&K troops to help the British.) The Afghan was equally startled when the Russians failed utterly to provide some 30,000 troops that Ali believed they had promised as support in the event of a British intrusion. The British quickly took control of eastern Afghanistan, after which they again, as per their 1839 campaign, withdrew the bulk of their troops. With the Afghans under significant pressure, the new Amir, Yaqub Khan, the son of the now deceased Sher Ali, agreed the Gandamak Treaty with the British in May 1879. As a result, the British obtained control of Afghanistan's foreign policy and control of the strategic passes from Afghanistan to India. This did not satisfy some Britishers, who wanted control of the whole Afghan nation, a rather ambitious desire, given the Afghans' known dislike of foreigners. In return, the Afghan ruler received a promise of British protection against invasion by Russia and Persia and an annual subsidy of £60,000. This important arrangement for the British would continue until 1919.

While the British initially did well in Afghanistan in 1878, particularly in negating Russian influence, Afghan irregulars again inflicted casualties on the remaining invaders. Another slaughter of British citizens, including the British Resident in Kabul in September 1879, was reminiscent of events in 1839–41. The British also suffered a major loss of life in a humiliating defeat at Maiwand, 80 km north-west of Kandahar, in July 1879. Out of a force of 2,500 soldiers, almost 1,000 were killed. Although Afghan casualties were at least twice as heavy, the British had not suffered such a loss since their last escapade into Afghanistan in 1839. An avenging British Indian Army under the leadership of the capable General Roberts entered Afghanistan in late September 1879. Roberts and his force accomplished a lot: an Afghan force near Kabul was defeated; some brutal retribution was taken against Afghans; the British agreed that Abdur Rahman, the grandson of Dost Muhammad and Sher Ali's nephew, would be Afghanistan's new ruler; Abdur confirmed the Gandamak Treaty and was installed as Amir in June 1880, after which nominal control of Afghanistan was given to him; and, the besieged town of Kandahar was freed in September 1880. British forces then quickly withdrew. They had effectively negated the Russian threat in Afghanistan; their campaign had restored British military prestige. In June 1880, however, a change of government in London forced Calcutta to renounce its forward policy. Fortuitously, Abdur Rahman proved to be a capable and reliable ally able to satisfy British strategic requirements. Locally, he would become known as the tyrannical 'Iron Amir'.

Despite the British being busy with, and in, Afghanistan, the British and the Russians meanwhile sought to devise a satisfactory border between their empires. While the 1878 Congress of Berlin stemmed Russian assertiveness in Turkestan, the movement of Russian troops shortly before this treaty into the Wakhan and Chitral areas north of J&K had concerned the British. This was partly because the Russians had the superior position in this region, if only because they were actually aware of the situation on the ground. The British, conversely, were still trying to ascertain what physically comprised J&K. They had little idea what lay beyond it, including the Pamirs region to the north. The only Britisher to have visited the Pamirs was John Wood in 1837–38, who located the source of the Oxus River at Lake Victoria. In 1873, the (poorly informed) British had agreed a border

with the (better informed) Russians that essentially was ‘a straight line’ that ran westward ‘from the eastern end of Lake Victoria on the Great Pamir to the junction of the Kokcha river with the Oxus [Amu Darya]’ river in north-eastern Afghanistan. The ruler of Afghanistan was not consulted about this border. This cartographic line was to Russia’s advantage. However, its vagueness also encouraged St Petersburg to try to claim some territory south of the Oxus River. Problematically, it also left ‘a gap of 60 miles between Afghanistan and the Chinese province of Sinkiang’.⁴⁹

While seeking to determine a satisfactory border with the Russian Empire, two serious incidents increased British concerns about Russia. First, in 1879, a Russian force unsuccessfully attempted to capture Geok-Tepe, a Turkoman fortress town located west of Merv and east of the Caspian Sea, in order to secure Russia’s southern border. Undeterred, in 1881, the Russians returned and bravely captured the town, then brutally avenged their previous defeat. This victory crushed the Turkomen and ended their trading in slaves. Geok-Tepe’s capture worried the British far more than previous Russian gains of Bukhara, Khiva and Kokand as this brought the Russians closer to Merv, considered by some as ‘the queen of the world’. From this strategic oasis, the Russians could relatively easily move against Herat, a convenient gateway to Kandahar, and to India beyond. In 1884, Merv itself fell to Russian control, supposedly after local Turkomen requested Russian intervention in order to bring them peace and the benefits of civilisation. Coming soon after the second Anglo-Afghan war from 1878–80, the fall of Merv heightened British fears. Indeed, it gave them a ‘fit of “Mervousness”’ that Russia might be intending to invade India,⁵⁰ especially given Russian plans to connect Merv to the Trans-Caspian railway line that ran from the Caspian Sea into Central Asia, ostensibly to facilitate trade and travel. However, if used in conjunction with the Volga River that was navigable from European Russia to the Caspian Sea, this new railway line increased Russia’s ability to move military materiel and men, both now more readily available following Russia’s improved situation in the Caucasus, to areas significantly closer to the British Indian Empire. South of this railway lay Afghanistan, particularly the strategic city of Herat, and the strategic passes that led into J&K. (Merv was connected to the Trans-Caspian Railway in 1886.) Almost concurrently, British unease was compounded by a book published by Major-General Sir Charles MacGregor, the head of the new Indian Intelligence Department established in 1887. MacGregor publicly theorised that, should the Russians decide to attack India, they might do so concurrently via five routes: Herat; Bamian; Kabul; Chitral (near J&K); and, Gilgit (in J&K). MacGregor may have been using his book to lobby for increased spending on the Indian Army and on the construction of roads and railways to strategic border areas.⁵¹ Equally, it would have been difficult to defend against his scenario.

The second serious incident occurred in March 1885 when Russian forces seized some Afghan territory south of the Oxus River at Panjdeh (now Serhetabat, Turkmenistan), an oasis roughly halfway between Merv and Herat. Known as the ‘Panjdeh Incident’, this event caused a major diplomatic crisis between Britain and Russia, with the former incensed about the latter’s aggression and duplicity. British public opinion was enflamed and hardliners on both sides called for war. Although Panjdeh was then part of Afghanistan, the southward-moving Russians desired the oasis, particularly as they believed it had been under the control of Merv, which town they now possessed. Before Panjdeh’s capture, the Afghans had moved forces to reinforce the oasis, while a Joint Anglo-Russian Boundary Commission, formed in mid-1884, had been trying to agree Afghanistan’s northern border. These deliberations were suspended because of the Panjdeh Incident. For the British, Russia’s capture of Panjdeh suggested further Russian movement southwards towards Afghanistan, which British forces had only recently sought to placate. It also made the British fear that the Russians would try to annex the entire Pamirs region. Should the Russians do so, the two empires would then

be contiguous, a scenario the British had long dreaded. War seemed imminent. The British started to mobilise 25,000 troops who, if needed, would march via Quetta to defend Herat should the Russians continue southwards. Concurrently, the Royal Navy was put on full alert and ordered to monitor Russian naval movements. Some Britishers, including one stationed in nearby Gilgit, believed that, 'when war hung in the balance' in 1885, the Russians had moved 'some thousands of her troops towards the Pamirs'.⁵² If correct, this directly threatened J&K.

The Panjdeh Incident and its aftermath were probably the closest that Britain and Russia came to war in relation to their respective Indian and Central Asian empires. A direct conflict did not eventuate, however. The Russians, who did not relish any British presence in Herat, realised that, on this occasion, their imperial rivals were deadly serious and intended to fight, if necessary. Concurrently, the Afghan Amir, Abdur Rahman, proposed restraint. He did not want his country embroiled in an Anglo-Russian war that, almost certainly, would have impacted negatively on Afghanistan. Cooler British and Russian heads also prevailed, coupled with some meaningful diplomacy. Even so, the British electorate saw this denial of war as a surrender to Russian aggression. As a result, the Conservatives trounced the sitting Liberals in the 1886 British elections. Post-Panjdeh, Anglo-Russian strategic rivalry and rhetoric cooled significantly and generally remained calm thereafter. Indeed, in 1887, the Anglo-Russian Boundary Commission was able to demarcate the frontier of northern Afghanistan with Russian Turkestan. There was no Afghan involvement because, by then, the Amir had ceded control of Afghanistan's foreign policy to the British. In return for retaining Panjdeh, the Russians ceded some territory further west from it to Afghanistan, which apparently satisfied the Afghans. Anglo-Russian rivalry also cooled because other, more important, matters were increasingly needing to be considered. These included Indian nationalism, domestic pressures in Russia, and the rise of other nations, chiefly Germany and Japan.

Post-Panjdeh, the focus of British-Russian anxiety and great gamesmanship moved east to the undemarcated Pamirs region, where the border was still very unclear and where the British were in a decidedly weaker position. The first major British exploratory and mapping party had only entered this remote region in 1885, significantly later than the Russians, who had been probing south from the Pamirs towards Chitral and Gilgit for some time, often without the British knowing. In August 1891, an incident occurred at Bozai Gumbaz, at the eastern end of the Wakhan area, when some Russian troops, claiming that the Pamirs region officially was now Russian territory, aggressively expelled the exploring, and protesting, Francis Younghusband. Following some strong British protests and the overt mobilisation for war of an Indian Army division stationed at Quetta, the Russians, who then had economic and political problems of their own at home, backed down. Thereafter, the incident was resolved quietly and diplomatically, with the Russians apologising, removing their troops from the Pamirs and supposedly sacking the offending Russian officer who had been in command (but who in reality was promoted). The anxious British then sought some certainty from the Russians about this strip of 'no-man's land', also known as the 'Pamir Gap', while, concurrently, they took steps to shore up their southern border with it by securing J&K's northern frontiers. This included assertively imposing their will on the rulers of Hunza and Nagar, in northern J&K. The British feared that both men had, unacceptably, been in touch with, and were sympathetic to, the Russians.

In 1893, certainty finally came to Anglo-Russian territorial relations when British and Russian officials resolved the issue of sovereignty over the Pamir Gap. These officials determined that the Afghans would control territory in the southern part of the Pamirs, most of which comprised a narrow salient or panhandle known as the 'Wakhan Corridor', and which, at its eastern end, briefly abutted China. They also decided that the Russian border ran from the eastern end of Lake Victoria to the

(uncertain) Chinese border and that the Wakhan Corridor to the south of this border was Afghan territory that should remain neutral. In 1895–96, a Joint Anglo-Russian Boundary Commission agreed on the specifics of the northern border of the Wakhan Corridor. Both Afghanistan and China took no direct part in creating this formal buffer which, effectively, would divide the British and Russian empires. (Indeed, China did not officially accept this border until 1964.)

The Wakhan Corridor itself comprised a narrow mountain barrier some 220 km long, 15 km wide at its narrowest point and 65 km wide at its widest point. The Wakhan River flowed through the middle of the salient, with its valley supporting a small population of ethnic Wakhis. Kirgiz nomads lived in the mountainous eastern areas. Flowing westerly, the Wakhan River joined the Panj River and its tributary, the Pamir River, both of which rivers formed a significant part of the northern border of the Wakhan Corridor. The territory was generally rugged and remote, although a historic trade route between Yarkand, in Sinkiang, and Badakhshan, in the north-east of Afghanistan, went through the corridor. The British assertion of the Afghan Amir's control over the Wakhan Corridor sent a message to St Petersburg: Russia could not occupy this salient 'without risking direct conflict with Britain'.⁵³ In 1894, the British demarcated the entire 1,650-mile long border between Afghanistan and India, including the southern border of the Wakhan Corridor which, itself, was also J&K's northern border. This became known as the 'Durand Line' after Mortimer Durand, then Foreign Secretary of India (and brother of Colonel Algernon Durand), who had negotiated most of this highly important border over a six-week period in 1885 with the Afghan ruler, Abdur Rahman. The creation of the Wakhan Corridor gave the British, Russians and Afghans certainty about their respective territories and borders. It also instituted a border arrangement that continues to exist. Despite the creation of the Wakhan Corridor, British fears of a possible Russian invasion of J&K via the Pamirs did not disappear, even though the nearest major Russian cantonment was 400 miles away across long and difficult communication and supply lines. Major Russian activity in the Pamirs and/or in Sinkiang and/or in Tibet—actual, perceived or potential—needed monitoring. The British created the Gilgit Agency as one vehicle to undertake such monitoring.

In 1889, the British re-established the Gilgit Agency. This was partly because Younghusband, while exploring the Pamirs and passes into J&K, had unexpectedly met a Russian counterpart, Grombchevsky, and some Cossacks in the spring of 1888 in the Raskam Valley, east of the Karakoram Range and west of Yarkand. Grombchevsky also visited the *Mir* (ruler) of Hunza in 1889, where he apparently was welcomed warmly by this self-perceived descendent of Alexander the Great. The Mir allegedly granted Russia permission to establish a military post on his territory. Such a treasonable act justified the British re-establishing the Gilgit Agency, as did Younghusband's subsequent discovery of some Russians in Yasin in 1891. Equally, the distantly-related rulers of Hunza and Nagar may have asked the British to return due to the increased Russian 'presence' nearby, although, given the Hunza ruler's strong dislike of the British, this seems unlikely. Gilgit's importance as a listening post to monitor Russian activity in the Pamirs and Sinkiang was enhanced in 1891 when Gilgit town, the Gilgit Agency's administrative centre, was connected by road and telegraph to Srinagar. In 1900, the British also appointed two men to watch the important Mintaka and Dafdar passes located north of Hunza and south of Tashkurgan, a fort town about 140 miles south of Kashgar. These men reported to Gilgit. While nominally part of J&K, the Gilgit Agency was essentially under British control. It comprised the small and previously autonomous entities of Chilas, Hunza (sometimes called Kanjut), Ishkuman, Kuh Ghizar, Nagar, Punial, and Yasin. The hereditary rulers of Hunza, Nagar and Punial, along with the 'rulers' or governors appointed by the J&K administration for Chilas, Ishkuman, Kuh Ghizar and Yasin, were forced to acknowledge Dogra suzerainty. They did

so grudgingly or as the result of being invaded. In 1870, the rulers of Hunza and Nagar, the region's two most important administrative entities located on opposite banks of the Hunza River some thirty miles north of Gilgit town, had signed treaties with Maharaja Ranbir Singh. Each April, these locally influential rulers would pay tribute to the Dogra Maharaja via the British Political Agent at a major public gathering and popular polo tournament in Gilgit town. Nevertheless, there was much local disenchantment with the interloping Hindu Dogras, in particular, and with the British.

Dogra involvement in the greater Gilgit area goes back to 1848, when J&K State Forces made the first of their three attempts between 1848 and 1869 to subjugate the Mir of Hunza's warlike forces. Things were relatively quiet from 1869 to the late 1880s. After some vicious family in-fighting in Hunza in 1888 and in Nagar in 1891, more aggressive men respectively became ruler of Hunza and heir-apparent of Nagar. In 1888, the advancing Dogras confronted a combined Hunza-Nagar force that had captured the important fort at Chalt, situated some fifteen miles west of both principalities. Chalt was then the northernmost outpost of J&K. The combined Hunza-Nagar action was somewhat surprising as, despite having the same ancient forebears, both entities had been longstanding rivals and bitter enemies. Equally, however, both regions traditionally united against external opposition. After some difficult fighting, the combined Hunza-Nagar force was expelled from Chalt fort, although the malcontents took the fort's guns with them. They would later use these against the British. The rulers of both principalities seemingly harboured a greater desire for a relationship with the Russians, although this was partly to unnerve or extract better terms from the British. This may have worked, as the British temporarily placated the rulers by increasing their subsidies in 1889 after each signed a treaty with the British representative, Colonel Durand. One aspect of this treaty involved them agreeing to stop their robbing, raiding and plundering of neighbouring districts and peoples, and along the Leh-Yarkand Road. Because they lacked productive agricultural lands, these activities had traditionally been these rulers' main sources of income.

In 1891, Hunza-Nagar disenchantment increased after the British informed each ruler that the British needed to have free access to the rulers' territories in order to protect J&K. This British action possibly resulted from the incident at Bozai Gumbaz shortly before when Russian forces expelled Younghusband. Furthermore, the rulers were informed that the British were going to build a road to each principality, with most of the more northerly Hunza region, except for its capital of Baltit (now Karimabad) in the south-east of the entity, particularly difficult to access. This road would go via the strategically located Chalt, which was roughly midway between Gilgit town and the capitals of both principalities. Both rulers disapproved of this intrusion. They roused their subjects to oppose these British moves and an uprising began. The Mir of Hunza sought military help from the Russians in Tashkent, who, to his chagrin, refused, although they did encourage the Mir to resist the British.⁵⁴ The Chinese supported the rebellion diplomatically. The 'Hunza-Nagar Field Force', led by Algernon Durand, dealt with this uprising. It comprised 1,000 regular soldiers from the Indian Army and from the newly-constituted, British-led Imperial Service Corps that comprised soldiers from India's princely states—although, in this instance, all the soldiers came from J&K. There were also some 250 irregular soldiers, mainly Pathans and Punialis, drafted in from nearby road construction duties. An even larger force of 2,000 coolies, mostly engaged in carting food and fodder, supported this large force.⁵⁵

A difficult four-week war resulted. For the Imperial Service Corps, this was the first operational campaign fought under its own banner. Ultimately, the Hunza-Nagar Field Force triumphed after some tough, aggressive and brave fighting during cold winter weather in which three (of sixteen) British officers were awarded the Victoria Cross for extraordinary acts of bravery. Nagar succumbed first,

then Hunza, after which 600 soldiers occupied their respective capitals. The most northerly point reached by the advancing soldiers was Misgar, strategically located in north-eastern Hunza near the Mintaka Pass, beyond which lay Chinese Sinkiang. Following the Field Force's victory, members of the re-established Gilgit Agency attempted to shore up British and Dogra control of this distant, strategically important and northerly area. Meanwhile, the deposed and defeated Mir of Hunza fled to Urumchi, Sinkiang, where he received support from China, including having the Hunza jagir in Yarkand, south of Kashgar, assigned to him. In 1892, his half-brother replaced him as Mir. The aged Mir of Nagar was allowed to retain his throne because his aggressive son had forced his father to fight against his will. In 1892, the son was apparently deported to Kashmir. The Anglo-Dogra victory over Hunza and Nagar finally brought all of the parts of the Gilgit Agency under the supposed rule and control of the Maharaja of J&K. This victory also resulted in the Chinese protesting to the British Government about the British invasion of China's suzerain, Hunza, from which China still received tribute at Kashgar. The Chinese representative in Kashgar also sought to appoint the replacement ruler of Hunza, to which the British thought it prudent to appear to acquiesce.

Increasingly, the assertive British became the actual administrators of both Hunza and Nagar. In 1913, the British established the Corps of Gilgit Scouts to enhance their position in J&K's northern frontier area and to reduce their physical dependence on the Imperial Service Corps and the J&K Army. The 20,000-strong Imperial Service Corps had been established to help defend India's frontiers. It and the J&K State Forces would be used during World War I. Their replacement security force, the Gilgit Scouts, was a British-officered militia that comprised men recruited from all areas of the Gilgit Agency. This gave this force considerable local knowledge. It also meant that its members were already acclimatised to the harsh local climate and conditions. The Gilgit Scouts monitored all foreign activity in the greater Gilgit region and along J&K's northern borders. It had no connection with the J&K State Forces. In 1935, the British furthered their control of northern J&K when they secured control of the area around Gilgit town itself. This area became known as the Gilgit Leased Area. The major British concern then was the Soviet Union's increasing domination of neighbouring Sinkiang. British control of the Gilgit Leased Area ensured their total control of northern J&K, including the area where its forces, the Gilgit Scouts, were headquartered. In November 1947, the Gilgit Scouts, led by a British officer, would play a significant anti-Maharaja role.

In neighbouring Chitral, a princely state to the immediate west of Gilgit, the *Mehtar* (ruler), encouraged initially by the British, was supposed to acknowledge Dogra suzerainty, even though his major links were with the adjacent Badakshan and Wakhan areas of Afghanistan. The principality may have once included the Gilgit Agency's Kuh Ghizar and Ishkuman areas. In 1880, the Afghan Amir claimed that Chitral was part of Afghanistan. However, the 1894 Durand Line clearly made Chitral part of British India, which meant that Chitral separated north-western J&K from north-eastern Afghanistan. The Mehtar may have had connections with Russia, which was interested in this region if only to cause the British problems. In 1892, the reasonably amenable Mehtar of Chitral, Aman-ul-Mulk, died. Thereafter, British-Chitral relations became difficult. In March 1894, the British had to force-march soldiers from Gilgit through deep snow, inclement weather and hostile forces, via the 12,000-foot Shandur Pass, to capture Chitral fort in which 400 British soldiers were besieged. The perpetrator was Sher, the latest Mehtar—there had been five rulers in a little over two years—supported by a neighbour, Umra Khan, in Swat. The 1,300-strong force from Gilgit included 900 irregulars from Hunza and Nagar, who now not only were accepting of British overlordship but also were actively participating in their military exploits. A larger force of 15,000 men also left from Peshawar under similar conditions, with the same mission. It fought its way north via the 3,500-foot

Malakand Pass and the 10,000-foot Lowarai Pass, the southern gateway to Chitral. Some saw these troop movements as a 'rehearsal for crushing any future Russian moves against India's northern borders'.⁵⁶ After considerable hardship for both relieving forces, the smaller Gilgit force arrived first and freed the British who, by then, had been besieged for 47 days. While the relief itself had been highly important, some British had been concerned that the Russians might take advantage of the instability in Chitral. The Russians chose not to. To continue such deterrence, the British decided to maintain a permanent military presence at Chitral, as well as troops at strategic locations to its south. Had they not done so, some Russians apparently had made plans to occupy Chitral.

Because the Mehtar of Chitral was supposed to acknowledge Dogra suzerainty, some people—mainly post-1947 Indian politicians, such as Jawaharlal Nehru—suggested that Chitral was part of the disputed territory that comprises J&K. There is evidence to show that the Dogra Maharaja was suzerain to Chitral because of a treaty signed in 1877 between Maharaja Ranbir Singh and Mehtar Aman-ul-Mulk. However, Chitral was never actually part of J&K. It never came under the Maharaja's full, direct and complete suzerainty, nor did the British ever treat Chitral as being subordinate to J&K itself. Indeed, in 1895, following the crisis in British-Chitral relations, Chitral was moved from the control of the British Political Agent in Gilgit to the Malakand Agency in the Frontier Districts of Punjab (later NWFP). The British had created Malakand specifically to manage the adjacent princely states of Chitral, Dir and Swat. They also had built a strategic road from Swat to Chitral, both of which principalities were contiguous to north-western J&K. Nehru may have made his claim to Chitral to enhance India's bargaining position in the event of a negotiated settlement to the Kashmir dispute with Pakistan. In reality, Chitral was never politically or administratively part of J&K.

Ongoing British strategic concerns re India's and J&K's neighbours

By about 1895, the British and the Dogras had militarily and politically consolidated their hold on J&K, including its more remote parts. Nevertheless, despite their efforts, the British remained nervous about their northern and north-western frontiers through which potential invaders might invade India. There were two reasons for this perennial nervousness. First, the British were never able to fully placate or subjugate the Pukhtoons who lived in the strategically important tribal areas located on the north-western edge of the Indian Empire. Instead, they sought to 'manage' these tribesmen using a 'carrot and stick' approach that involved distributing largesse or punishment. Second, continuing Russian expansion did nothing to ease British fears about the perceived Muscovite menace that the British had sought to counter in Afghanistan and which, as they saw it, they also needed to counter on J&K's northern frontier. Depending on whether 'hawks' or 'doves' were in charge in India, the British dealt with the Russian, later Soviet, threat in one of two ways. These swung like a pendulum. The British used either a forward policy or a policy of masterly inactivity. The former was aggressive, expensive and with uncertain results. The latter was cheaper, easier to implement and sustain, and usually involved minimal loss of British lives. Most senior British administrators generally favoured masterly inactivity.

Regardless of which policy the British employed, active British participation continued in the largely covert Great Game. Increasingly, the arena for this game became unstable China, to J&K's north and east. Should Peking lose control of eastern Turkestan/Sinkiang, this would offer major strategic opportunities to the geographically well-placed Russians. Vicariously, this would impact on J&K. Hence, the British sought both to influence China in relation to Russia and to limit Russian

involvement in Sinkiang. In 1890, Francis Younghusband was employed to 'stiffen' China's policy towards Russia's expanding presence in the Pamirs. From 1890, a British officer, George Macartney, who had been Younghusband's translator, was stationed at Kashgar as the 'Special Assistant to the Resident in Kashmir for Chinese Affairs'. Ostensibly, Macartney reported to the British Resident in Srinagar, some 650 miles, and five weeks by return mail, away. Runners first carried Macartney's messages from Kashgar to 'nearby' Gilgit, about three weeks away by return mail. Deliveries would proceed provided that the tracks—there were no roads—and passes, such as Mintaka and Burzil, were not blocked by snow, as was the case for about six months each year. (Similarly, weather permitting, messages from Russia's consulate in Kashgar took ten to twenty days to reach Tashkent, albeit via an easier route because of the railhead north-west of Kashgar at Andijan, from which a line went to Tashkent.) Carrying messages from Kashgar to Gilgit, and beyond to Kashmir and to British India, took messengers through significant linguistic diversity: Turki in Kashgar; Sarikoli and Wakhi, a dialect of Persian, south of Kashgar; Burushaski around Hunza and Nagar; Shina in Gilgit; then Kashmiri, Urdu or English, south of Gilgit.⁵⁷

It took the British time to obtain significant or official influence in Sinkiang. The Indian and British Governments were reluctant to lobby Peking strongly to grant George Macartney official status, possibly because India and J&K had few commercial or other interests in Sinkiang. Some Indian traders and money lenders operated in Yarkand, the usual entrepot for Indian goods coming from Leh; a few 'Kashmiris' had become landowners in Sinkiang; there was a humane desire to liberate some enslaved Indians. In the greater strategic game, Hunza's relationship with the Raskam area also was important, as were any Russian moves to territorially extend their empire. Despite managing one of the largest British consular districts then in existence, China did not extend Macartney any official status until 1908. This was partly due to Russian opposition. Equally, the Chinese felt no pressing need to do so. Nevertheless, Macartney was able to monitor Russian and Chinese moves, as well as to influence the Chinese on occasions over Raskam and other matters. In doing so, he had to compete with the official, assertive and often acerbic Russian Consuls. Their power and influence peaked following the unexpected Chinese nationalist Boxer Rebellion (1898–1901), after which some 170,000 Russian troops occupied Manchuria, an action that greatly displeased a rising Japan.

In 1908, Chinese authorities finally granted the British permission to establish a consul in Kashgar, after which the patient Macartney became the official British Consul. Russia had withdrawn its objections following the significant and secret 1907 Anglo-Russian Convention that improved British-Russian relations and essentially marked an end to the Great Game. This agreement partly arose because, by 1907, Germany had become the common threat for both nations. Thereafter, Russia and Britain agreed to mutually guarantee China's territorial integrity, to adhere to their respective spheres of influence in Persia (where they were the major competitors), for Russia to avoid direct contact with Afghanistan, and for Tibet to exist as a neutral buffer state. In relation to J&K, Tibet was the most important issue as it was adjacent to J&K's north-eastern Frontier Districts Province and to the remote Aksai Chin area which the Dogras claimed was part of J&K. However, soon after the 1907 Convention was concluded, China deposed the Dalai Lama and returned Tibet to being a Chinese feudatory. This situation did not last long. The Dalai Lama, who had fled to India in 1910, returned to power in Tibet after the successful revolution in 1911 ended China's imperial system, created a republic, and brought Sun Yat Sen to power. Thereafter, Tibet was essentially independent until 1950, when it became an autonomous region in the People's Republic of China (PRC).⁵⁸

By 1910, Tibet had lost its place of importance in those British minds desirous of improved India-Tibet trade and political relations. While most India-Tibet trade went via Sikkim, there also was

some minor trade from Ladakh, although this route was longer and more difficult. Otherwise, the British had controlled Tibet's lucrative trade in fine shawl wool with Kashmir from 1867 via Leh, although the concurrent decline in the desirability of Kashmiri shawls reduced demand for this high-value commodity. Political relations had proven so difficult to achieve that, in 1903, some British forces led by Younghusband invaded the remote, closed, lama-dominated country of Tibet from Sikkim, eventually capturing Lhasa. The British did so supposedly to settle disputes over the Sikkim-Tibet border, to 'encourage' trade, and 'to put Britain's relations with Tibet on a firm and proper basis'.⁵⁹ More pointedly, the aggressive and impetuous British action was undertaken to exclude perceived increasing Russian influence in Tibet and to prevent the development of closer Tibet-Russia relations, as the Dalai Lama supposedly desired. The British action was also to make the point that some haughty British imperialists could take such action whenever they wanted to. An embarrassed London later repudiated the treaty that Younghusband's superior force had imposed on Tibet in August 1904. The invaders, to their chagrin, did not find a shred of evidence of Russian involvement in Tibet. After the 1903 British invasion, Tibet, whether under Chinese suzerainty or not, was never as important an issue for the British as Russian attempts to control Sinkiang or to threaten the Indian Empire's northern ramparts. The insular Tibetans lacked the Russians' expansionist tendencies, not to mention their modern military prowess and firepower.

The early 1910s posed significant challenges for the British. The demise of the Qing/Manchu Dynasty in 1911 made China both unstable and a problem for the British for the remainder of their time in India. This was particularly so in relation to the control and stability of Sinkiang. A significant factor that complicated J&K's relationship with China was the Chinese perception that Hunza, next to Sinkiang, was China's minor tributary state. Equally, on occasions, both the British and the Mir of Hunza tried to use this status to their advantage to extend the J&K border into China. Meanwhile, the British were never mollified nor prepared to fully lower their guard regarding the Russians, including in relation to Russian activities in China. To maul a popular saying, the price of empire was eternal vigilance—and intrigue. One factor that helped improve British-Russian relations in the early twentieth century were some serious problems that Russia confronted in 1904–05: chiefly devastating land and naval defeats by Japan in the Far East and its 1905 revolution. Another factor was both nations' pragmatic need to deal with the palpable rise of Germany as a great power with strategic reach beyond Europe. Associated with Germany's rise was its alliance with the weakening Ottoman Empire whose instability and ethno-religious links with people in Central Asia, Persia, Afghanistan, India and even Muslim-majority Sinkiang, plus the increasingly popular pursuit of pan-Turkic nationalism, could have been exploited to the disadvantage of Britain and Russia. China's neutrality until 1917 did not ease British and Russians concerns, although the British did get Chinese agreement to post fourteen Gilgit Scouts on Taghdumbash Pamir during World War I to prevent 'enemy agents' (Germans or Turks) from entering Afghanistan or J&K.

British fears of Russia returned soon after the Bolsheviks seized power in late 1917, repudiated the Tsar's debts to French and British banks, and pursued an aggressive international agenda. In 1922, the Bolsheviks created the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR), or Soviet Union. In the late 1920s, it became a serious threat to British interests after Josef Stalin consolidated power and actively sought to export revolution in order to extend Soviet power and influence or to destabilise rival nations. This included, as the British perceived it, the USSR seeking to annex eastern Turkestan (Sinkiang), or to bring this region contiguous to J&K into Moscow's orbit. Stalin's rise also coincided with China's civil war between the Nationalists and Communists, during which Peking's writ was often weak in western China, as a result of which warlords fought for local control. After

the Bolsheviks consolidated their revolution, the British also became increasingly concerned about aggressive Soviet activity in nearby Persia and Turkestan/ Central Asia. Previously, with Germany on the rise, Britain and Russia had split a weak and subjugated Persia into three zones: a northern Russian zone, which included Teheran; a middle or neutral zone; and a southern British zone, which included the entrance to the Persian Gulf. This latter zone was important for Britain as it allowed British forces to protect potential land invasion routes to India.

Things changed in 1908. Following the discovery of oil, Persia became increasingly important for British shipping, both naval and mercantile, which were converting from the heavier coal, to the lighter, less voluminous oil as a source of fuel for maritime engines. Persia/Iran had enormous amounts of this vital strategic resource that the British, and others, increasingly coveted. During World War I, Germany became the major concern for the British in relation to Persia, particularly as the Germans tried to provoke trouble there. From 1915, a joint British-Russian force called the 'East Persian Cordon' patrolled the Afghanistan-Persia border to prevent any attempts by Germany and/ or the Ottoman Empire to foment problems for the British or the Russians in, or around, Afghanistan, which was neutral in World War I. The British also feared a combined attack by German and Turkish forces in Central Asia, a threat that became more realistic following the demise of the Tsarist Empire and the rise of the Bolsheviks. The latter's peace treaty with Germany in March 1918 freed up significant numbers of German troops on the Eastern Front for action elsewhere.

The concern of the British with aggressive Bolshevism, later Soviet Communism, continued following the Bolshevik Government's withdrawal of Russian soldiers from the East Persian Cordon in early 1918, after which this militia comprised British soldiers only. Thereafter, the militia's focus, and that of the British in general, was on 'what Churchill called "the bacillus" of Bolshevism'.⁶⁰ The British had a consulate in Meshed (Mashhad) that was an important listening post to monitor Russian, then Soviet, activity along the nearby and important Trans-Caspian Railway Line. In 1918, the East Persian Cordon clashed with Bolshevik forces near Ashkhabad, located north of Meshed in Russia's Trans-Caspian region, who were attacking anti-German, anti-Bolshevik White Russian forces then in control of the Trans-Caspian Railway Line. The Cordon remained in this Russian area until early 1919. Ironically—and despite mutual fears for over a century of an 'inevitable' British-Russian military conflict—the 1918 clash was the first time that any British and Russian soldiers fought each other in Asia since the Great Game was instigated in the early 1800s.⁶¹ Thereafter, the German threat (temporarily) diminished for the British while the Soviet threat increased, with Lenin apparently keen to strike at British imperial supremacy via either a revolution in India or an attack on India, possibly instigated from Central Asia. For all the British knew, any such attack could have involved J&K's northern passes.

Meanwhile, in Afghanistan, the forces of the opportunistic ruler, Amanullah Khan, fought, but lost, the third Anglo-Afghan War in 1919. The British were greatly assisted in this war by being able to use air power, a recent development that provided a decisive military advantage. Apart from provoking uncertainty in their enemies, using planes lessened the need to deploy large numbers of British troops to Afghanistan to physically fight hostile Afghans. Despite losing the war, Amanullah Khan obtained some major concessions, including control of Afghanistan's foreign policy. The nervous British did so partly to avoid antagonising a potential Soviet ally. Essentially, Afghanistan was now independent, a situation confirmed by treaty in 1921. An emboldened Amanullah allowed an anti-British Provisional Government of Free India to operate in Kabul. Conversely, acting cautiously, he later refused an opportunistic plan by Adolf Hitler for a German-Soviet invasion of India via Afghanistan, much to British relief. The independent Amir watched warily during the 1920s as the

USSR reincorporated western Turkestan into its orbit and then as Stalin divided this area into autonomous republics with difficult borders and ethnic mixtures in order to weaken ethnic nationalism. Three of these five 'stans' bordered northern Afghanistan and shared overlapping ethnic populations: Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, and Tajikistan.⁶²

Concurrently, the rise of Japan and its increasing power and physical involvement in China from 1894 would pose significant problems for the Chinese and the Russians and, vicariously, would improve Britain's situation in Sinkiang. Japan's rise significantly shifted China's focus eastwards, particularly to Manchuria, where the Russians and the Japanese were competing for territory and resources. After the end of the 1904–05 Japan-Russia war, China benefitted as a peace treaty mediated by the United States returned Manchuria to Chinese rule. This didn't end the matter, with the Japanese invading China in 1931 and establishing Manchukuo. Nevertheless, partly because of Chinese concerns with the rise of Japan and partly because of significantly decreased Russian 'assertiveness' following the events of 1904–05, the Chinese felt happy to oblige the British in Kashgar. After 1908, when Peking granted official status to the British Consul, British trade to Kashgaria doubled, with only the difficulties of transport via the difficult Leh-Yarkand or Gilgit-Kashgar routes limiting further expansion. Confronting major and destabilising problems in the 'motherland', Russian influence in Kashgaria declined after the 1917 revolution and remained minimal for many years. By 1935, however, the Soviet Union had re-asserted itself in Sinkiang, after which India's trade became one-twentieth of that during Tsarist times.⁶³ This Soviet resurgence partly occurred because the Red Army had physically helped a Soviet puppet to obtain power there. This increased Soviet influence throughout Sinkiang, including in southern Kashgaria, made both the British and the increasingly powerful Japanese uneasy.

British nervousness about J&K's northern frontier was compounded by Moscow's negation of all of Russia's previous international treaties, its consolidation of Central Asia by the mid-1920s, and the re-emergence of Soviet influence in Kashgar soon after. In 1934, some serious unrest in Kashgar between Turkic fighters and Chinese forces resulted in the deaths of some (British) Indian citizens. Consequently, from 1935, the British 'encouraged' the ruler of J&K, Maharaja Hari Singh, who obtained power in 1925 following Maharaja Pratap Singh's death, to allow them to directly control the entire northern Gilgit area of J&K's Frontier Districts Province. This would give the British greater administrative efficiency throughout the entire Gilgit Agency. Equally, the USSR was becoming increasingly interested in Sinkiang, while the Gilgit Agency itself was under direct threat from a neighbouring Chinese warlord, backed by the Soviet Union. The British also may have been displeased with the autocratic Hari Singh, whom they had helped to suppress a popular rebellion by Kashmiris in 1931 and whom they worried might want, like his forebears, to approach China or Russia for assistance, or even a strategic relationship. After applying significant pressure on the Dogra, the British obtained control of Gilgit town and its surrounds in 1935 via a 100-year lease. This became known as the Gilgit Leased Area. It comprised the 'settled areas' around Gilgit town where the headquarters for the Gilgit Agency were located, where the British administrators and soldiers were accommodated, and where Gilgitis lived. The surrounding Gilgit Agency itself comprised the tribal areas of Chilas, Hunza, Ishkuman, Kuh-Ghizar, Nagar, Punial and Yasin which, administratively, were considered to be *tehsils* (sub-districts). From 1935, therefore, a British Political Agent from the Indian Government's Political Department directly administered both the Gilgit Agency (1941 population: 77,000) and the Gilgit Leased Area (1941 population: 23,000). He did so 'on behalf of His Highness' Government'. To enhance the security of his distant communications, the Political Agent reported to New Delhi via Peshawar, not Srinagar.

This new arrangement in Gilgit in which the British were dominant shored up their administration and strategic circumstances in northern J&K. Importantly, this made it difficult for any Dogra ruler to maintain contact with any foreign entities. The new arrangement also confirmed the importance of the greater Gilgit area as a forward observation post from which the British could monitor untoward foreign activity in, near, or adjacent to, northern J&K, including in Sinkiang Province and the USSR's Tajikistan Republic, north of the narrow Wakhan Corridor in far eastern Afghanistan. They also wanted to counter any Soviet attempts to propagandise in J&K where some people, particularly politically motivated Kashmiris, had distinct left and socialist leanings. Conversely, as the Soviets saw matters and despite their ideological beliefs otherwise, the 'exploitative' and 'capitalist' British were proving remarkably resilient in India continuing to 'suppress' millions of 'reactionary' Indians led by Gandhi and other members of the Indian 'bourgeoisie'. This made China, where Communists increasingly were confronting Nationalists, although not necessarily with Moscow's support, a more attractive place to foment revolution. Ultimately, however, the Soviets only revolutionary success in Asia before 1947 would be in Mongolia, which became a Soviet satellite in 1921.

What the Dogras did not control

By around 1889 when the British re-established the Gilgit Agency, the princely state of Jammu and Kashmir essentially comprised the territory that it was in 1947. It had three provinces: Jammu, Kashmir and the Frontier Districts. The Maharaja's administration nominally controlled most parts of these three provinces, although there were some exceptions, as we shall see. For a start, Dogra rule in more remote parts was weak or indirect. In the Gilgit region, for example, Dogras exercised little direct control, including over the sometimes rebellious state of Hunza. For 200 years, the Mir of Hunza had paid tribute annually to officials of China's Qing/Manchu dynasty located in Kashgar. He possessed a jagir in the Yarkand (now Shache) area of Chinese-controlled Sinkiang that the Chinese had granted to repay Hunza's help suppressing an insurrection in Turkestan in 1847. The Mir also had access to, and possibly claimed, cultivable and grazing lands located east of the Karakoram Range and west of Yarkand in the Raskam and Shaksgam areas of Sinkiang that some of his subjects, whom the Chinese called Kanjutis, annually farmed, grazed and intermittently paid taxes to China for utilising. Finally, the Mir may have received tribute from a lesser ruler in the Taghdumbash Pamir north of Hunza. Although the *Mir* of Hunza eventually accepted Dogra suzerainty, the British only forced him to end his tributary relationship with China in 1937, chiefly because, at times, they had been able to exploit the China-Hunza relationship to British advantage, particularly when China was weak. After the successful 1911 revolution, China became more assertive, even hostile, in its foreign relations with Britain and Russia, including in relation to Kashgaria. Equally, according to the Mir, after the British in 1889 diminished his and his subjects' abilities to supplement their incomes by robbing, plundering and capturing people in northern J&K and selling them into slavery, his lands in Sinkiang became economically more important to Hunza. These lands were well beyond the control of the Dogra rulers.

Hunza was one of the seven formerly independent entities that came to comprise the Gilgit Agency in the 1880s. The British controlled this region until 1947. From 1935 until 1947, the British also controlled the Gilgit Leased Area. These two areas, while politically part of J&K, were never fully administratively or economically integrated into the princely state. This has led Pakistan to suggest or infer on occasions, including via maps,⁶⁴ that the Gilgit region is neither part of J&K nor part of the Kashmir dispute. Official maps of Pakistan invariably include J&K. However, they often show the

smaller and northerly 'Gilgit Agency' (which encompasses the usually unshown Gilgit Leased Area) as being a separate entity not part of J&K. They also show J&K as being 'Jammu & Kashmir (Disputed Territory)', which includes Azad Kashmir, but not Gilgit, bordering the latter region, to its south. The inference is that the Gilgit area is not part of the Kashmir dispute. A map by Pakistan's Ministry of Kashmir Affairs and Gilgit-Baltistan goes even further, with Gilgit, plus Baltistan and Azad Kashmir, all not shown as 'disputed territory'.⁶⁵ These Pakistani positions are factually incorrect: the Gilgit Agency and the Gilgit Leased Area were politically and administratively part of J&K when Pakistan came into being in 1947. Indeed, on 1 August 1947, the British had openly and publicly retroceded (returned) both Gilgit areas to Maharaja Hari Singh's direct, albeit tenuous, control. Many newspapers reported this act. For example, the headline in the Lahore-based *Civil & Military Gazette* on 29 July 1947, two days before the actual event, was 'Retrocession of Gilgit to Kashmir'. One day after the event, the same newspaper's headline on 2 August 1947 was 'Gilgit Retroceded to Kashmir'. This action occurred fourteen days before the British departed the subcontinent on 15 August 1947. Ironically, a map in a book by a former military dictator of Pakistan, General Mohammad Ayub Khan, confirms the Gilgit Agency and the Gilgit Leased Area as being part of J&K. Ayub shows all of J&K as being disputed.⁶⁶

Similar inaccuracies, in what amounts to 'cartographic aggression', occur with other maps. The demarcated Line of Control (LOC) that divides J&K into Indian J&K and Pakistan-Administered J&K officially ends at NJ 980 420, roughly 50 km south of the border with China. Beyond this point, the ceasefire line/LOC was never demarcated. However, many Indian and Pakistani maps, and many international maps,⁶⁷ often incorrectly and contentiously, show the LOC as going right to the China border. Indian maps invariably show the LOC as going north-west from NJ 980 420 to the China border; Pakistani maps usually show it going north-east to this border. India also, on occasions, officially complains about maps, or refuses to allow maps to appear in publications in India, that do not adhere to its official position 'that the entire State of Jammu and Kashmir is an integral part of India'.⁶⁸ 'Correct' Indian maps, therefore, do not show the realistic, on-the-ground administrative situation in J&K. Indeed, they either show all of Azad Kashmir and Gilgit-Baltistan, but without naming these specific entities, as being part of 'Pakistan Occupied Kashmir', or, more confusingly, they show the districts that comprise these two unmentionable entities as they existed pre-accession. Consistently, the most accurate and apolitical maps of South Asia, including maps of J&K, are produced by the United Nations.⁶⁹

Another matter worth noting is that Dogra Maharajas exercised no actual control over the unpopulated, high-altitude desert region of Aksai Chin—nor possibly did anyone else, for that matter. The Dogras' claim to this high plateau was based on victorious expeditions into the Skardu (or Iskardu) area of Baltistan and the Ladakh area made by Gulab Singh's General Zorawar Singh in the 1830s-40s. Baltistan, to the east of Gilgit, comprises the area north of Kashmir astride the treeless Deosai Plains and along the Indus River. It lies roughly between the Great Himalaya mountain range and the Karakoram Mountains around the former Skardu Tehsil of Ladakh. Aksai Chin is located to Baltistan's east beyond the Karakoram Mountains. Ladakh is south of Baltistan, east of Kashmir, west of Tibet and north of India. Zorawar Singh's expeditions to these remote regions were completed before J&K came into existence, with his capture of the Ladakh area supposedly including Aksai Chin. A subsequent J&K claim to Aksai Chin occurred after an Indian Survey Officer, W.H. Johnson, developed his 'Johnson Line' boundary that showed Aksai Chin as being within J&K. Johnson had visited Khotan, Sinkiang and Aksai Chin in 1865. This line almost exclusively was 'his' line, apart

from one important early supporter, the second Maharaja of J&K, Ranbir Singh, with whom Johnson may have been seeking employment. Possibly, Johnson sought to impress his prospective employer with his (envisaged) boundary that enlarged J&K's area.⁷⁰ Significantly, the 'Johnson Line' appeared on a map in 1868. It has since become a major basis for India's current claim to the desolate Aksai Chin region. A British Director of Military Intelligence, Sir John Ardagh, in the late 1890s confirmed Johnson's idea and further proposed that the China-India boundary be located at 'the crests of a series of ranges to the north of the Karakoram, among them the Kuen Lun [Kunlun] range'. These 'extreme forward formulations' did not appear on official maps, however. Nor did the British ever communicate Johnson's or Ardagh's alignments to China. Conversely, Chinese officials already had told Younghusband that Chinese territory began at the Karakoram Pass, after which it followed the Karakoram Range northwards along the watershed. In 1892, China apparently erected a boundary marker at the Karakoram Pass to this effect.⁷¹

The Dogras had a further partial claim to Aksai Chin that arose from British cartographic aggression. From around 1914, the British, without a signed formal treaty that specifically dealt with delimiting borders, increasingly attempted to impose their desired India-Tibet border on a weak Tibet and its troubled suzerain, China. This border of approximately 2,000 miles (3,200 km) comprised three sectors: western, 700 miles (1,000 km); middle, 400 miles (650 km); eastern, 700 miles (1,000 km). Sikkim, which was a British protectorate, was not part of the border problem as Britain and China had agreed its border in 1890. The border in the western sector, which equated to the Tibet-J&K border, went from the Karakoram Pass south to Demchok, an area located astride the Indus River near the far south-eastern corner of J&K's Ladakh region. Aksai Chin abutted the middle and northern sections of this western border. The British sought to push this border much further north-east to China's Kunlun Mountains, which was the northern edge of the Aksai Chin area and the natural border between Sinkiang and Tibet. This would have located Aksai Chin in the British-expanded and Dogra-ruled J&K. Apart from the Chinese and Tibetans' strong disinterest in ceding Aksai Chin to J&K, the Russians also were opposed to such an assertive British move. In the middle sector of the India-Tibet border from Demchok east to Nepal, the British followed the same assertive approach. In the eastern sector from Bhutan to Burma, they advanced their interests by trying to unilaterally impose on Tibet the 'McMahon Line' named after the senior British official at talks held at Simla in 1914 between Indian Government and Tibetan officials. The British sought to advance the Tibetan border from the base of the Himalayas to its summits, an act that 'ceded considerable land to the British'.⁷² Sir Henry McMahon knew about borders, having earlier physically demarcated the Durand Line between Afghanistan and India. Many Indians have effectively Indianised the McMahon Line by incorrectly calling it the 'McMohan Line', with Mohan a popular Indian given name.

British attempts to impose its border on Tibet and China became urgent, particularly in the eastern sector, as World War II and the threat from an aggressive, expansive Japan became imminent, then stark. Both Tibet and China were opposed to such British claims and attempts, although there was then little that these weakened or divided polities could do. British attempts ended when they divided the subcontinent in 1947 and left the region and its border issues to India and Pakistan. Post-colonial India continued essentially to pursue the assertive British approach. New Delhi also had a strong desire for Nepal to be at least a buffer state between China and India and, at best, for Nepal's northern border with China to be part of India's defence perimeter that Indian forces controlled and patrolled. After 1949, however, India confronted a more formidable, although not unreasonable, China. From the mid-1950s, Tibet fell out of the equation after India recognised that this province was an integral part of the People's Republic of China, a position to which India still adheres.

Another matter worth noting is that, until 1936, the Poonch Jagir was a separate, semi-independent state ruled by a Raja, with a 90 per cent Muslim population, and ‘generally on bad terms with its Kashmiri overlord’.⁷³ The Raja of Poonch, Jagatdev Singh, was the great grandson of Gulab Singh’s brother, Dhyan Singh, and therefore a distant relative of the Maharaja of J&K, Hari Singh. The Raja had his own small army, collected his own taxes and was entitled to a 13-gun salute. His hilly-to-mountainous domain comprised 1,627 sq. miles. This made it larger than many of India’s princely states, including high profile and far wealthier ones, such as Cochin (1,418 sq. miles) and Cooch Behar (1,318 sq. miles). Before 1936, Poonch was a feudatory state under the suzerainty of J&K, although the British generally let both royal houses resolve their relationship and issues as semi-equals. After 1936, Maharaja Hari Singh, with British support, brought the Raja of Poonch under his (Hari’s) strict control. Poonch was demoted in status to a subordinate jagir, and the Raja’s 13-gun salute was reduced to nine. Hari Singh had been assertive towards Poonch from his ascension to the J&K throne in 1925. Apart from some old inter-family rivalry, Hari’s assertiveness may have been because he ‘lost’ the Gilgit Leased Area, and its taxable citizens, to the British in 1935. Following Poonch’s demotion, Hari Singh ensured that J&K administratively integrated the region into Jammu Province, after which he imposed his own (onerous) taxation on Poonchis. This was additional to the Raja’s existing taxation system. Hari Singh’s actions helped motivate Poonchis to oppose him in 1947 and create Azad (Free) Kashmir, much of which comprised the Poonch Jagir.

Challenges to Dogra rule

Although the British strongly supported the Dogra Maharajas, these rulers nevertheless faced some challenges to their autocratic rule of J&K between 1846 and 1947. A first was the British re-establishment of the Gilgit Agency in 1889. Ostensibly, this was to do with the British need to monitor and control J&K’s remote and sensitive border areas. Equally, the British action was justified because of questions about Maharaja Pratap Singh’s loyalty and his ability to effectively and efficiently rule J&K. By 1889, the British may have believed that Pratap, like his father Ranbir, had been communicating with the Russians. Ranbir had sent emissaries to Central Asia around the mid-1860s, actions the British appear to have tolerated. Ranbir also had possibly wanted to expand his territory into the fertile Shahidulla (Xaidulla) area of Sinkiang, located north-east of J&K beyond the Karakorams and accessed via the Shimshal Pass, ‘the Gateway to Hunza’. Not wanting to provoke Peking, the British disallowed this move. The evidence against Pratap was stronger. The British Resident discovered thirty-four secret letters, some in Pratap’s handwriting, in which Pratap allegedly sought help against British rule. These letters had been written to the former Sikh Maharaja, Dhalip Singh, now living in exile in England, to some Russians, and to some other recipients.⁷⁴ The British could not tolerate such actions. They sidelined Pratap Singh and re-established the Gilgit Agency. For similar strategic reasons as in 1889, the British insisted in 1935 that Maharaja Hari Singh agree to the British controlling the ‘Gilgit Leased Area’.

The second exception to rigid Dogra control of J&K was the British-dominated Council of State (or Council of Regency) that sidelined Maharaja Pratap Singh and directly administered J&K from 1889–1905. The Government of India appointed all Council members, while the British Resident in J&K had full veto powers over the Council’s activities and decisions. The British imposed this body on Pratap due to his regime’s disorganisation and maladministration. Apart from wanting access to J&K for trade purposes, in the post-Mutiny environment in which the British were seeking to ensure that subcontinentals of all religions were ruled fairly and decently, possibly disorganisation in J&K

was tolerable, but maladministration was not. The British had been looking at the poor, unfair or inept Dogra administration for some time. Their ability to monitor events in J&K was helped after they imposed a Resident on Pratap once he became Maharaja of J&K in 1885. Beforehand, a devastating famine in 1877–79 had brought J&K to the attention of the British. (Kashmir's worst famine in 1746–47 long pre-dated Dogra rule and British oversight.) This famine caused large losses of Muslim lives, with possibly as many as three-fifths of Kashmiris in the Kashmir Valley dying. Although a famine concurrently occurred throughout the subcontinent following the failure of the annual monsoon, J&K's famine was due in part to Maharaja Ranbir Singh's insistence that Kashmiri farmers, almost all of whom were Muslims, could not harvest their crops until one of his administrators was physically present to assess each crop for taxation purposes. This delay, made by a ruler who may have been more fanatical and cruel than his father, permitted autumn rains to damage much of these crops. Poor administration exacerbated the situation. The British also were becoming aware that Dogra Maharajas favoured fellow Hindus financially and with the distribution of land, jobs and privileges, to the considerable detriment of Muslims. By Pratap's time, a substantial *Dharmath* (Religious) Trust Fund was allocating large amounts of money to propagate and support Hindu temples and ventures, as an investigation in 1890–92 by a British official confirmed. This meshed with a Dogra aim that Jammu should rival Benares (Varanasi/Kashi), located on the Ganges River in northern India, as India's holiest city, which some Dogra rulers sought to fulfil by building Hindu temples, particularly in Jammu town. Muslims' discontent was increasing as they became more aware of the British desire for princes to engage in good and decent governance.

Two other factors worked against Pratap Singh. One was timing. Pratap ascended the throne on 12 September 1885 when the British were nervous about Russian activity. The Panjdeh Incident had occurred in March 1885; in 1886, people in Yasin had revolted; and, in 1887, as Britain and Russia demarcated the northern border of Afghanistan, the Russians were building the Trans-Caspian Railway line into Central Asia. The British were particularly sensitive about the Jammuite contacting any Russians. A second factor was inter-family rivalry. Ranbir and others doubted Pratap's administrative skills. Pratap also did not always agree with his youngest brother, the ambitious and pro-British, Raja Amar Singh. Their rivalry had begun around 1885 when the British, who had to confirm all new rulers, 'regulated' Pratap's 'doubtful' succession.⁷⁵ The doubt concerned Pratap's lineage, with Amar and the middle brother, Raja Ram Singh, believing that their father, Ranbir, had exchanged his first born child, a girl, for the son of a Brahmin, whom Ranbir named Pratap.⁷⁶ If true, Pratap was not their blood relative but a pretender to the throne. In a DNA-free age, the younger brothers' claim was unproveable. The British took full advantage of this family division and genealogical opportunity: they confirmed Pratap's rule and imposed a fully-fledged British Resident on a Dogra Maharaja for the first time. A further factor was that Pratap was 'without issue'. In 1895, Amar Singh exacerbated this situation by fathering Hari Singh, who became Pratap's heir apparent. Amar also claimed that his eldest brother had been in touch with the former Sikh ruler, Dhalip Singh, as was possibly confirmed by the British Resident's discovery of some letters from Pratap to Dhalip. More sinister accusations also were made about Pratap wanting to harm his two brothers, and the British Resident.

The ultimate outcome of the various accusations against Pratap Singh was the imposition of the J&K Council of State in 1889. It comprised five members: Pratap's two brothers, Ram and Amar; an experienced European official; and two Hindu Pandit bureaucrats. With Pratap sidelined, the British Resident was the indisputable 'final arbiter' in J&K's affairs between 1889–1905. He was strongly assisted by the capable Raja Amar Singh, who served as J&K's Foreign Minister. By 1891, a visiting

Britisher proudly noted that ‘Great changes are now being effected in Kashmir: we are actively interfering in the administration of the country, and introducing much-needed reforms, which will produce important results in the immediate future ... [in this] northern bastion of India’. To ensure these ‘important results’, the British ‘lent’ Pratap’s administration some senior officers, civilian and military, to ‘superintend the much-needed reforms’.⁷⁷ These included a settlement officer, who looked at Kashmir’s entire (and exploitative) land tenure system, and a military secretary who sought to overhaul, update and instil discipline into the J&K State Forces. For the British, an indisputably pro-British Council of State in J&K suited them, given a weak and unstable China nearby, Russia’s successful expansion into Central Asia, and its growing industrialisation and seemingly unsatisfied strategic ambitions. Some British wanted this arrangement to become permanent, although such a desire waxed and waned depending on British strategic fears and perceptions. Overriding British desires was some residual sanctity associated with the 1846 Treaty of Amritsar, particularly the clause that Gulab Singh and his male heirs should rule the princely state of J&K, not Britishers. Ultimately, one of these male heirs, Pratap, had the last laugh. Unlike his two brothers, the Maharaja was physically small and often unwell. Nevertheless, he well and truly outlived both siblings: Ram died in 1899; Amar in 1909; Pratap in 1925. Equally, allegations existed that Pratap may have had one or both of them poisoned.⁷⁸

Such assertive British intervention against Indian princes perceived to be backwards and/ or abusing their power was not unusual in the late 1800s and early 1900s. Generally, however, World War I moderated such imperial practices, chiefly as the British needed Indian princes to provide troops for the ‘war effort’. Post-war, with India a member of the League of Nations and the Imperial Conference, the British sought to enlist the princes as allies against the freedom-seeking Indian nationalists who were posing an increasing challenge to British rule of India. The princes, who were neither populists nor often popular, could do little to stem Indians’ increasing desires to change the political status quo. In J&K’s case, Pratap Singh’s situation slowly improved from 1905, although it wasn’t always ‘plain sailing’. That year, the British allowed the chastened Maharaja to again rule ‘his’ princely state because, by then, J&K’s accounts and administration had been rectified and were functioning well. Concurrently, British strategic concerns about Russia had diminished as St Petersburg dealt with a major popular uprising and a powerful Japan. Pratap had also developed an excellent relationship with the outgoing Viceroy, Lord Curzon, who, seemingly as a parting gift, restored Pratap’s rule. Concurrently, however, Curzon tellingly instructed Pratap that Raja Amar Singh would be his ‘chief minister and righthand man’ and that he (Pratap) could rely on ‘the counsel and support of the British Resident’.⁷⁹ With Amar’s death in 1909, Pratap’s situation further improved and his authority became less fettered. Thereafter Pratap ruled J&K until 1920, but with lesser powers than during his first period of rule from 1885–89, plus he was still largely beholden to the Resident. During World War I, Pratap strongly supported the British war effort. Post-war, with the British looking for princely support to counter the Indian freedom movement, the imperial power largely restored all of Pratap’s pre-1889 powers. The Dogra ruler now only needed to ‘consult’ the British Resident on important matters, not defer to him.

Things would have been different in J&K if the childless Pratap Singh had got his way in relation to nominating his heir and successor. In 1906, Pratap sought to adopt his distant relative, Sukhdev Singh, as his successor as ruler of J&K. This would have meant that, on Pratap’s death, Sukhdev would have become the Maharaja of J&K—not Hari Singh, the son of Amar Singh, Pratap’s estranged youngest brother and rival. Born in 1901, Sukhdev was a prince in the junior Poonch royal house whose members were descended from Raja Dhyani Singh but which was a feudatory under Pratap’s

indirect control. Sukhdev would serve as Raja of Poonch from 1918 to 1927. In 1906, however, he was only an infant. Equally, the British were still prepared to adhere to the Treaty of Amritsar, Article I of which clearly devolved J&K 'to Maharajah Gulab Singh and the heirs male of his body'. Hari Singh, from Jammu, was one of these 'heirs male'; Sukhdev Singh, from Poonch, was of Dhyan's male line. Calcutta would therefore not allow Pratap to adopt Sukhdev as his princely successor, although he was allowed to adopt the young Poonchi prince as his personal and spiritual heir. This position gave Sukhdev no political or administrative role in J&K during, or after, Pratap's rule. Equally, Pratap's attempt to elevate and empower the Poonchi prince may have been one reason why Hari Singh ensured that Poonch was demoted in 1936 from being a separate, semi-independent state to a subordinate jagir.

By 1925, Maharaja Pratap Singh had developed great distaste for his nephew and appointed successor, Raja Hari Singh, the son of Amar. In 1915, Pratap had promoted Hari to the position of Commander-in-Chief of J&K State Forces. By 1921, however, Pratap was displeased with Lt General Hari Singh's reported 'youthful escapades'. The most serious of these was Hari's blackmail by a prostitute in Paris, in response to which the Jammuited paid a record, and astonishing, £300,000 as 'hush money' to his blackmailers. This escapade came to light in a thirty-nine-day civil court case in London in late 1924 in which the person blackmailed, 'Mr. A', whose name the India Office in London had tried to suppress, was revealed to be Raja Hari Singh. This matter further added to the longstanding Pratap-Amar 'dynamic' when Pratap was near the end of his life. Nevertheless, in 1925, the British stuck to the agreed Dogra succession and, although Hari Singh was tainted with scandal, he was allowed to succeed his deceased uncle, Pratap, with 'little upset or protest'.⁸⁰ Pratap's relative and spiritual heir, Sukhdev, lit Pratap's funeral pyre in accordance with Hindu rites and traditions. For the religiously-minded ruler considered to be the most devout of Indian princes and a major patron of Brahmins and ascetic sadhus, this act of ignition had been important.

Such inter-family distaste and rivalry distracted, rather than weakened, Dogra rule in J&K. The first rivalry arose soon after Gulab's brothers, Dhyan and Suchet, were killed in 1843 and 1844 respectively. As early as 1848, Dhyan's offspring sought British intercession to resolve some succession issues, including the proposition that Poonch was a feudatory state of Jammu and Kashmir under the supreme control of their uncle, Gulab Singh. The British ruled in favour of Gulab, possibly with their overwhelming reason being not necessarily to ensure justice, but to ensure stability in a new frontier state that had an influential and powerful ruler. Although inter-family rivalry and issues arose on occasions, these ended in 1936 when Maharaja Hari Singh, with British acquiescence, finally ensured that Poonch would be a jagir. Family rivalry aside, J&K Maharajas ruled their domains through an unrepresentative and tightly-controlled administration in which they and their surrogates held the major organs of power and violence. These included a state-wide administration (except in the Gilgit Agency), an army of 10,000 soldiers, and a police force of 3,500 men. Pro-Dogra Hindus dominated all three bodies, particularly at the officer level. J&K's majority 'community' of disparate Muslims enjoyed little status or influence.

Despite running autocratic regimes, the Dogra Maharajas did face opposition on occasions. Three incidents stand out. The first was about who qualified to be a 'State Subject'. This status applied to a local person of J&K who had a legitimate right to live in, and own immovable property in, the princely state. Usually, this was someone born in J&K. Such people comprised Jammuites, Kashmiris, Gilgitis, Ladakhis, Baltis and Poonchis, in the broad geographic sense of these terms. J&K-ites obtained their unique State Subject status in 1927. While restrictions on movement into and out of Kashmir had been in place previously, the issue of who should be allowed to live and work in

J&K first arose in 1889. This followed one of the Council of State's first edicts that made Urdu the language to be used for, and by, J&K's administration. A popular language in northern India, Urdu was considered more approachable than the highbrow Persian employed in Kashmir since Mughal times. Whilst the use of Urdu was a supposed reform, its use actually empowered Punjabis who already spoke this language and whom the British favoured as administrators. Conversely, it disadvantaged J&K-ites, particularly those in the small, well-educated Kashmiri Pandit community who had long specialised in being Persian-literate administrators but whom some British considered corrupt. Many Jammuites also had more in common with Punjabis than Kashmiris. Increasingly, the J&K administration employed educated and trained Punjabi Hindu 'outsiders' in civil service positions, supposedly to help reorganise the J&K administration along 'modern', or British-inspired, lines. Local uneasiness resulted.

By 1925, the issue of who should be administrators in J&K had become a major one. As early as 1910, an anti-Punjabi agitation had begun in J&K. While this didn't directly threaten Dogra rule, the agitation became so significant that, in order to quell local unease, Maharaja Hari Singh passed a law in April 1927 that specifically defined a State Subject. There were four classifications within this status. Class I State Subjects comprised all persons resident in J&K before 1885. Those who came to J&K between 1885 and 1911 were Class II State Subjects. Class III State Subjects comprised those who came to J&K after 1911 and before 31 January 1927 and who had obtained a concession or permission to purchase immovable property. Class IV State Subjects related to companies.⁸¹ Hari Singh's act ameliorated J&K-ites as it limited the ability of 'outsiders' to work in J&K, especially in one of the few major places of stable employment, the J&K administration. However, Hari Singh also used this law to assert his control over land, with only State Subjects being able to purchase immovable property in J&K after 1927. Undeterred, some foreigners partially circumvented this law by purchasing moveable houseboats that they had Kashmiri boatmen move around and moor on Kashmir's various lakes. Finally, only people who were State Subjects had a legitimate right to live in J&K. As we shall see, this became significant in the post-British events of 1947.

A second challenge to autocratic Dogra rule occurred in 1931 when Kashmiris mounted a serious anti-Maharaja uprising in the Kashmir Valley. This followed some efforts started around the early 1900s by socio-religious bodies to improve the pitiful lot of J&K Muslims. These efforts culminated in 1924 when some leading Kashmiris presented a memorandum to the Viceroy who was visiting Srinagar. The Maharaja's response was harsh, including imprisoning or expelling petitioners. By 1931, J&K-ites were suppressed and sullen. The catalyst for their uprising that year was the alleged desecration of the Koran by a Hindu policeman in Jammu. In response, Kashmiris particularly were vocal, especially after the Maharaja's police force killed twenty-one people and wounded many more in Srinagar on 13 July 1931. Hari Singh also responded with heavy-handed arrests, imprisonments, floggings and, in some instances, further shootings. There was significant popular unrest and violence throughout Kashmir Province, particularly in Srinagar, Anantnag (sometimes called Islamabad), Shopian, Baramula (now Baramulla) and Sopore. The agitation spread to Jammu Province, where pro-Muslim groups also protested. As a result, the British sent three companies of armed troops (about 500 soldiers) to support the J&K ruler and to restore law and order. The 1931 uprising had become serious. Indeed, it 'was possibly the most serious communal outbreak in India between the Moplah rebellion [in southern India] of 1921 and the Calcutta riots of 1946'.⁸² A young Kashmiri leader called Sheikh Muhammad Abdullah came to prominence during the uprising. He became known as the 'Lion of Kashmir' ('Sher-e-Kashmir'). Abdullah and the all-powerful Maharaja would have an ongoing rivalry until late 1947.

After the 1931 uprising, the aloof Maharaja Hari Singh reluctantly instituted a constitutionally-based democracy in J&K. This followed some serious British intervention by J&K's Resident, some official prompting from New Delhi, and an investigation by a British official, Sir Bertrand J. Glancy, from the Government of India. The system that Hari Singh reluctantly devolved to his *praja* (people) was very limited. It did not allow for universal adult suffrage, with only about five per cent of J&K-ites entitled to vote. It did not allow free speech, freedom to congregate and protest, or freedom to politically oppose. The ruler tightly controlled the essentially powerless seventy-five-seat assembly known as the *Praja Sabha* (People's House) that he established and to which he appointed thirty-five members. Suitably qualified subjects owning land, having status or practicing a profession elected the other forty members, who comprised twenty-one Muslims (in a 77 per cent Muslim-majority state), ten Hindus, two Sikhs, six 'special constituencies' for landed interests (who invariably supported the Maharaja's positions), and one constituency for pensioners. Hari Singh's restrictive constitution and associated 'selections'—not elections—assured the ruler's tight control and autocracy, although this didn't always stop dissent, which chiefly came from (under-represented) Muslims. Significant anti-Maharaja, pro-reform protests re-occurred in 'politically backward' J&K in 1938 and 1946. Less obviously, but significantly, the ruler's autocratic practices informed J&K politicians and infused them with similar undemocratic ideals and practices. Post-1947, many of J&K's senior political leaders acted in similar ways to Hari Singh when they acquired varying degrees of power following his political demise.

A third challenge to autocratic Dogra rule was the 'Quit Kashmir' campaign in 1946 in which Sheikh Abdullah and his All-J&K National Conference political party sought to end Dogra rule in J&K. The campaign's title reflected the 1942 'Quit India' campaign that the Indian National Congress ('Congress') had mounted against British rule of India. In J&K, the political contest took place in the state's centenary year. It furthered the National Conference's groundbreaking 1944 'Naya Kashmir' ('New Kashmir') manifesto that sought both a genuine constitutional monarchy for J&K and major changes to the political and economic status of J&K-ites, including via major land reforms. By 1946, however, Abdullah and his colleagues were agitating for the Dogra regime to totally leave, or quit, the Kashmir Valley because he and his (mainly Kashmiri) supporters had come to believe that the British sale of Kashmir to Maharaja Gulab Singh in 1846 was an immoral and invalid commercial transaction that rendered the people of Kashmir, who had not been consulted, 'into servitude'. Seemingly, Abdullah and his supporters had no serious issue with Dogras ruling Jammu or other parts of J&K. To counter Quit Kashmir, the Maharaja declared martial law, arrested 900 political leaders after May 1946, and forced other political activists to flee J&K. He also arrested and jailed the 'communist agitator', Abdullah, and other members of his secular National Conference. This party, in turn, boycotted the *Praja Sabha* elections just before they were to be conducted in January 1947. This supposedly was to protest the ruler's actions against the National Conference's leaders; party members also were under severe duress from the regime. Most importantly, the party's popularity was much lower than hoped and expected, which suggested some electoral 'challenges'. However, by boycotting the *Praja Sabha* elections, the National Conference lost an opportunity to confirm its popularity among the limited electorate that voted, even though voter turnout was low. Consequently, its major opponent in J&K, the All-J&K Muslim Conference (formed in 1932), which was popular in Jammu and which was also under duress in 1947, won sixteen of the twenty-one seats reserved for J&K Muslims. This included some seats in the Kashmir Valley where the National Conference supposedly was the stronger party. These results suggested that the Muslim Conference was the most popular political party in J&K. While it probably was more popular in Jammu Province, the National

Conference almost certainly was more popular in Kashmir Province. Apart from geography being a significant factor, there was a further distinction: the National Conference was secular. In 1939, the Muslim Conference had renamed itself the National Conference to reflect Kashmiris' supposed secular nature and to allow non-Muslims to join the political process. In 1941, however, some Muslims who were disgruntled with the National Conference's secularism and with Abdullah himself, re-instituted the Muslim Conference. Thereafter, the two conferences competed strongly with each other. The re-creation of the pro-Pakistan Muslim Conference also anticipated the later division of J&K into pro-Pakistan and pro-India areas.

The Quit Kashmir campaign had important ramifications. Sheikh Abdullah's sentence to three years' rigorous imprisonment in J&K for sedition upset his lawyer and close friend, the influential and popular Jawaharlal Nehru. In June 1946, the Maharaja's forces had detained Nehru as he tried to enter J&K to defend Abdullah. Nehru's 'arrest was the turning point in the history of the State'.⁸³ The future Prime Minister of independent India apparently never forgave Hari Singh for this act. Furthermore, Nehru made a report to his Congress colleagues about J&K soon after his expulsion from the princely state. This put the issue of J&K's post-British status well and truly on Congress's agenda a year before the British departed the subcontinent. Only much later, and to their detriment, would political Muslims in India, such as the leader of the All-India Muslim League ('Muslim League'), Muhammad Ali Jinnah, take the issue of J&K's post-British status issue equally seriously. Jinnah had visited Kashmir in May 1944 and was well received by many Muslims, except some in the National Conference, who later that year released their comprehensive socialist Naya Kashmir economic and political manifesto, which seemingly had little impact on Jinnah. Certainly, Kashmir was never uppermost in Jinnah's mind in the way that it was in Nehru's. A second ramification was that, in the longer term, Quit Kashmir politically strengthened Abdullah and his ilk while it weakened Jammu-based opponents of Maharaja Hari Singh. The Muslim Conference's decision to contest the elections was partly encouraged by its increasing relationship with Jinnah and the Muslim League, whose members did not appear to be making the physical sacrifices of Congress members for Indian independence, such as allowing themselves to be arrested and jailed, sometimes for long periods of time.

Conversely, the greater role and prestige of Abdullah, coupled with his strong friendship with the popular Nehru, inspired increased support for the National Conference. This benefitted them when Nehru obtained power in India. Nehru's ascendancy also started the serious, and rapid, decline of Hari Singh and the disintegration of the Dogra dynasty in J&K. Concurrently, many Jammuities increasingly felt 'sand-witched [sic] between Kashmiri nationalism and Indian nationalism',⁸⁴ with little notice taken of their aspirations. Indeed, they started to feel like second-class citizens in post-1947 J&K because almost all political and administrative power went, or was given to, the Kashmir-based Abdullah and his National Conference. Apart from Hari Singh's swift political demise post-accession, a further factor assisted this process: many senior Muslim Conference politicians, almost all of whom were from Jammu, went or fled to Azad Kashmir. Without these Jammuities, there was little effective opposition to the National Conference in Indian J&K. Furthermore, after 1947, New Delhi focused more on satisfying or placating Kashmiris' needs and demands before considering those of Jammuities or Ladakhis. During 1947, there was a distinct shift of political power in J&K from Jammu to Kashmir.

PART THREE

FROM PRINCELY STATE TO DISPUTED STATE

The structure of India and J&K in 1947

After World War II, it became clear that the British were going to cut asunder the ‘jewel in the [British] crown’ and quit India—soon.¹ By the start of 1947, it became obvious that Indian politicians would need to make decisions about British India and that each princely ruler would need to determine the future of his princely state. On the cusp of the British departure, India comprised British India, with its seventeen provinces of varying sizes, populations and statures, and Princely India, which consisted of between 562 and 584 princely states—no one can say for certain how many—of varying sizes, populations and statures.² Some princely states were as small as a few acres, which made them difficult to categorise and count. For example, Vejanoness, one of the smallest princely states, comprised 22 acres and 200 people. It was one of 282 such states concentrated in western India’s Kathiawar peninsula, where half of the princely states were less than ten square miles in area and had annual revenues of Rs 10,000 or less. Conversely, Jammu and Kashmir was India’s largest princely state in 1947, with both an area of 84,471 sq. miles and international boundaries with China and Afghanistan. In 1945–46, the J&K regime collected Rs 58 million in taxes, rents, fees, fines and earnings,³ of which revenues the ruler and his family appropriated some 15 per cent.⁴ J&K was only just India’s largest princely state. Hyderabad, at around 82,000 sq. miles, was slightly smaller, but more populous: 10.3 million people compared with J&K’s 4 million.⁵ Surrounded by British India, Hyderabad would have been much larger than J&K had its ruler controlled the region of Berar, over which he had nominal sovereignty but which the British leased and directly controlled as part of the Central Provinces (later largely Madhya Pradesh). Even so, Hyderabad was India’s wealthiest princely state.

India’s 560-odd princely states were divided into three divisions. There were 118 states that were ‘fully empowered’ members of the First Division, or Salute, States, including J&K. These states enjoyed minimal British interference unless the British, as paramount power, felt the need to intervene due to ‘gross misgovernment’ or to preserve the dynasty or state, thereby ensuring ‘peace in India’.⁶ All First Division rulers were entitled to direct representation in the Chamber of Princes that commenced operating in 1921, although not all rulers chose to participate in this representative body. There were 117 states in the Second Division, or Non-Salute, States. Second Division rulers had lesser local control and greater British involvement, and interference, than their First Division counterparts. As a group, they were entitled to send ten or so representatives to the Chamber of Princes. There was a third tier of some 327 states that essentially comprised hereditary rulers of landed estates. They had very limited rights and no representation in the Chamber of Princes. The princely state of J&K was a senior member of the First Division of States. Because of its size and strategic situation, it also was one of the most prestigious princely states in the Indian Empire. Indeed, the Maharaja of Jammu and Kashmir was one of only five Indian princes entitled to receive a 21-gun salute, the highest possible military salvo for an Indian ruler, at British-sponsored public gatherings.

(The Viceroy was entitled to a 31-gun salute.) The other four equally entitled princes were Baroda, Gwalior, Hyderabad and Mysore, each of whom, with varying degrees of enlightenment or otherwise, controlled similar large, wealthy, populous and prestigious princely entities.

In 1947, almost all princely states, except J&K, were partially or fully surrounded by territory that comprised British India. Some princely states had a single international land border with another nation: Bashahr, Garhwal and Sikkim each had a border with Tibet/ China; and, after 1937, Manipur had a border with Burma when the British separated the latter entity from the Indian Empire. Unusually, J&K had two international land borders: one with China to its east and north-east, respectively with Tibet and Sinkiang; another with Afghanistan to its north, beyond which was located Tajikistan in the powerful USSR. Additionally, the Indian provinces of Punjab and the North-West Frontier separated J&K from any other princely states, except neighbouring Chitral and Swat in NWFP, to J&K's north-west. The populations of British India and Princely India had historical, cultural, familial, geographic and economic links, such as roads and railways that criss-crossed the subcontinent, and some trade and commercial links. Otherwise, these populations were usually politically separate. Princely rulers sought to ensure that their subjects had little direct contact with the increasingly potent and popular Indian political parties based in British India, such as the Indian National Congress and the Muslim League, whose popularity increased as the division of the subcontinent became a reality. Similarly, princes sought to ensure minimal contact between their subjects and the influential leaders of these parties, such as the liberal, secular social democrat, Jawaharlal Nehru, and the secular, nominally (Shia) Muslim, Muhammad Ali Jinnah. Such leaders had popularity that few princes enjoyed, particularly those princes who ruled as aloof autocrats. Politically speaking, this enforced isolation often made people in princely states less directly involved in the freedom struggle than Indians in British India.

On 1 August 1947, Maharaja Sir Hari Singh's princely state comprised three provinces: Jammu, Kashmir, and the Frontier Districts. (See [Table 1](#).) Jammu Province, which included the Poonch Jagir after 1936, was Hari Singh's home province and J&K's most populous province. It was larger in area than Kashmir, but much smaller than the very large Frontier Districts Province. The Jammu region was located in the undulating-to-steep foothills at the end of the Punjab plain. In 1947, Jammuites had many ethnic, physical, social, economic and religious connections with the fertile Punjab area, including road and rail links from Jammu town (now sometimes called Jammu Tawi, after the River Tawi that flows through it) to nearby Sialkot. A major road went from Jammu town to Srinagar, through the Pir Panjal range via Banihal Pass. The Maharaja, his Dogra clan and the bulk of his administrators and soldiers in his army came from Jammu Province, which had the largest Hindu minority in J&K. Jammu town was J&K's winter capital. The major centres in the province were relatively accessible, although travel within it was not always easy due to poor roads and communications.

Jammu Province had two jagirs: the small Chenani Jagir, which was totally surrounded by Udhampur District, and Poonch Jagir. These jagirs had limited autonomy.

Table 1: The Princely State of Jammu and Kashmir in 1941

<i>Province</i>	<i>Area (sq. miles)</i>	<i>Population</i>	<i>Religious Composition</i>	<i>Number</i>
Jammu	12,378	1,981,433	61.19% Muslims 37.19% Hindus	1,212,405 736,862
Kashmir	8,539	1,728,705	93.48% Muslims 4.95% Hindus (Pandits)	1,615,928 85,531
Frontier Districts	63,554	311,478	86.86% Muslims 12.89% Buddhists	270,539 40,164
Total	84,471	4,021,616	77.06% Muslims 20.46% Hindus	3,098,872 822,955

Source: *Census of India 1941*, Volume XXII, *Jammu & Kashmir State*, [Part III](#), *Village Tables*, Srinagar, R.G. Wreford, Editor, Jammu and Kashmir Government, 1942.

Kashmir Province was roughly at the geographic centre of the princely state. The Kashmir Valley, which was divided into Anantnag and Baramula districts, comprised both the bulk of Kashmir Province and the famous and prestigious Kashmir region. In the province's third district, the Muzaffarabad District in the west, the terrain was hilly to mountainous. Muzaffarabad District had three claims to fame: it was Kashmir Province's least-populated and smallest district; J&K administrators considered its capital, Muzaffarabad town, to be J&K's 'Siberia' or 'Coventry' to which bad bureaucrats were banished; and the Jhelum Valley Road that linked Srinagar to Rawalpindi via Murree went through Muzaffarabad town, where a large Sikh population lived. Some considered this all-weather route to be the 'windpipe' through which the Kashmir Valley 'breathed'.⁷ Muzaffarabadis called it 'the Srinagar Road'. It was highly important because the other major road to Srinagar from Jammu via Banihal Pass was a fair-weather road often unavailable because landslides or snow blocked it. Being isolated in winter was an annual problem for Kashmiris, and, indeed, for all people in J&K's remote and high-altitude areas. The relatively homogenous Kashmir Valley also was the only part of J&K with no connections to any external entities: the Frontier Districts Province bordered NWFP, Afghanistan and China; Jammu Province bordered northern and north-western parts of India, most of which became Pakistan after 15 August 1947.

While the Kashmir Valley was small—about 6,000 sq. miles in area—it was the political centre of J&K. This was partly because Srinagar, which was J&K's summer capital and the capital of Anantnag District, was the princely state's largest and most important centre. With a 1941 population of 208,000, Srinagar was J&K's largest city. It also was the largest city north of Lahore and the twentieth largest city in India. (By comparison, Jammu town's population was 50,000, while the population of the nearby Punjabi cities of Sialkot and Rawalpindi, which were important centres for J&K in 1947, respectively were 138,000 and 181,000.)⁸ Culturally, socially, politically, ethnically and religiously, Kashmir was largely self-contained. It enjoyed significant homogeneity, with most people who lived there being ethnic Kashmiri Muslims of the Sunni religious persuasion, except for

5–10 per cent who were Shias. While relatively homogenous, Sunni Muslims in Kashmir could identify, or chose to identify, themselves as Shaikhs ('natives' of Kashmir whose Hindu forebears had converted to Islam), Syeds (who claimed descent from Prophet Muhammad), Mughals (whose forebears were from Central Asia), Pathans (whose forebears were from north-west India or Afghanistan), ethnic Gujjars and Bakarwals (semi-nomadic cowherds and shepherds who spoke a different language or dialect), and Doms and Watalas (whom both Hindus and most other Muslims regarded as 'Untouchables'). There was also a small and influential Kashmiri Hindu Pandit community of Brahmins that comprised the castes of Gors, Karkuns and Buhers.⁹ With little work or sufficient land available locally, many Kashmiri men, and many other men in J&K, obtained temporary or permanent work outside J&K, usually in nearby Punjab.

The Frontier Districts Province was a large, mountainous and remote area. It was separated from China's Sinkiang in the north-east by the Karakoram Range, with Sinkiang accessible via a rudimentary track through high-altitude passes. In the east, the province supposedly protruded into Tibet via the largely unpopulated Aksai Chin area, with the Tibetan plateau, which comprises about 2.5 million sq. km, accessible via the lower-altitude Changchenmo Route from Ladakh. The Gilgit area was accessed by road from Srinagar or via tracks from NWFP. All routes into the Frontier Districts Province were subjected to closure for six months or so by snow or landfalls during winter months. The province was lightly populated, with J&K's Buddhist population living in the east and its Shia and Ismaili communities located more in the north and west. These Muslims differed from other J&K Muslims who mostly were Sunnis. People in the Frontier Districts Province were often ethnically different from others in J&K, with strong Mongol and Tibetan influences present. Ladakhi Buddhists traditionally had close connections with Tibetan Buddhists and Buddhism. Baltis in the north-east of the province also had some ethnic connections with Tibet.

While it was easy to determine the administrative composition of J&K on 1 August 1947, it was more difficult to determine the ruler's or the people's political aspirations in relation to the future of the diverse, disparate and disunified princely state. Maharaja Hari Singh was an aloof ruler who disliked, and had generally discouraged, people's involvement in popular politics. His primary supporter had been the departing British. J&K did not have universal suffrage. Indeed, the majority of J&K-ites were not entitled to vote. Only people with the appropriate qualifications, as determined by the ruler, could stand for election to the local *Praja Sabha*, which was far from being a truly representative body. The residents of J&K's three provinces also did not have deep or abiding contacts, chiefly because the princely state's size and the distances involved hindered these. A common language was an impediment on occasions, as was the inability of people to move easily throughout the state due to poor or non-existent roads and their straitened economic circumstances. Furthermore, many Jammuites and Kashmiris were focused on areas outside J&K for work or for other matters, particularly Punjab. Many people in Gilgit, Baltistan and Ladakh were too remote from the subcontinent and essentially had to live locally. As a result, there was no great sense of state citizenship. These factors would impinge on J&K's ability to survive as a viable political entity.

The situation in August 1947

The most significant change for the ruler and residents of J&K since 1846 occurred on 15 August 1947 when the British departed the Indian subcontinent. On that day, British paramountcy lapsed and, in one of the first post-World War II decolonisations, the new entities of India and Pakistan came into existence.¹⁰ These actions took place based on the United Kingdom's Indian Independence Act 1947,

which had received Royal assent in London on 18 July 1947. The British departure involved two separate, but concurrent, processes. The first was the direct division by the British of British India into the new dominions of (secular) India and (Muslim) Pakistan, with the latter comprising eastern and western wings located on either side of the subcontinent. Importantly, the British divided the subcontinent with the active agreement of the Muslim League and the reluctant acceptance of the Congress, which had wanted India to remain politically unified, and of other parties, particularly disenchanted Indian Sikhs, who had wanted their own homeland. The main ‘logic’ or ‘rule’ for partition was that Muslim-majority areas which—and this is a very important qualification—were under the direct administration and control of the British only, should become part of Pakistan. This was not a neat, clinical process because other factors came into play. Furthermore, in all areas under indirect British control—that is, in Princely India—each ruler individually would decide whether to join their princely state with India or Pakistan. This meant that not all Muslim-majority areas of the subcontinent would necessarily become part of Pakistan, as some Pakistanis falsely believed, and still believe.¹¹ In relation to J&K, its ruler did not have to automatically join Pakistan simply because his state had a Muslim majority.

The second process for the British involved them encouraging, even pressuring, India’s princes, whose domains theoretically would become independent with the British departure, to join one of the two new dominions. The logic for this British approach was that each princely state was geographically part of the subcontinent and, given that they were largely surrounded and separated by British India, each would need some sort of arrangement with either dominion in order to function and to survive economically after the British departed. Each prince was encouraged to accede to a dominion with respect to foreign affairs, defence and communications, all matters that the British had previously controlled. Apart from three major recalcitrants amongst First Division princely states, all princes had either made accessions or had made their intentions clear when the British left India. Following the important withdrawal of British political support, India and Pakistan fairly quickly subsumed almost all princely states and their governing functions and powers. This process was aided by the euphoria of people wanting freedom from British or princely control, by pressure from India and Pakistan, and by the sheer fact of the states’ geographic separation and isolation from each other that made any major or potent princely political unification almost impossible. For their losses, princes were allowed to retain their personal lands and each was granted a privy purse that amounted to about ten per cent of their 1946 revenue. They surrendered ‘their states ... cash and investments ... [worth] 95 crores (£74½ million)’. (A crore is ten million.) In return, they ‘received privy purses that cost the Government of India 580 lakhs (£4 million) in the first year and less with each succeeding year’. As Sardar Patel, India’s powerful Deputy Prime Minister, astutely observed: ‘this was a small price to pay for the bloodless revolution that led to the ... unification of India’.¹²

It is worth examining briefly the partition of British India—the rapid surgical division of British-administered areas based on whether they had Muslim majorities or not that provoked massive political, social, cultural, geographic and economic upheaval in the northern part of the Indian subcontinent in 1947. This examination partially explains some of the India-Pakistan problems that resulted after, and because of, this significant event.¹³

In 1947, the British divided those parts of India that they controlled directly (that I have called British India). Almost all areas with a Muslim-majority population became Pakistan. The word ‘Pakistan’ is an acrostic. It comprises the following:

- ‘P’ for ‘Punjab’;

- ‘a’ for ‘Afghania’, by which was meant the Pukhtoos in NWFP who have strong links with Pukhtoos/Pushtoos in Afghanistan;
- ‘k’ for ‘Kashmir’;
- [the ‘i’ had no meaning, although revisionists now claim that it stands for ‘Indus River’; in a further revision, some Pakistanis claim that the area around this major river is the traditional and ancient homeland of ‘Pakistanis’],¹⁴
- ‘s’ for ‘Sindh’;
- ‘tan’ for ‘Baluchistan’.

Like all acrostics, this was a manufactured one, as we shall see. Yet, despite the acrostic, Pakistan has never obtained ‘Kashmir’—either the princely state or the region. Nor, based on the partition logic, was Pakistan entitled to obtain this entity. Unlike the other components of the acrostic that were under direct British rule, J&K was a princely state under indirect British control. Its ruler only would decide to which entity he would accede.

The idea of a separate homeland for Indian Muslims living in an area hived off, or partitioned, from the rest of India first appeared in 1930, when the influential Sir Muhammad Iqbal suggested a ‘consolidated North-West Indian Muslim State’.¹⁵ The acrostic ‘Pakistan’ evolved from an earlier, very similar acrostic ‘Pakstan’ that some Indian students in England, possibly inspired by Iqbal’s suggestion, first coined in 1933 in the pamphlet ‘Now or Never’. The students made an appeal, based on geography and some emotion:

on behalf of our thirty million Muslim brethren who live in PAKISTAN—by which we mean the five Northern units of India, Viz.: Punjab, North-West Frontier Province (Afghan Province), Kashmir, Sind and Baluchistan—for your sympathy and support in our grim and fateful struggle against political crucifixion and complete annihilation.¹⁶

Later, the letter ‘i’ was added to the ‘Pakstan’ acrostic to make it easier to pronounce. The vocally-improved acrostic ‘Pakistan’ has another interpretation. Rahmat Ali, who was involved formulating ‘Pakstan’ in 1933, claimed in 1947 that ‘the word *Pakistan* was composed of the following: *Punjab*, *Afghania* (North-West Frontier Province), *Kashmir*, *Iran*, *Sindh* (including Kachch and Kathiawar), *Tukharistan*, *Afghanistan* and *BalochistaN*’.¹⁷ Geographically, this later version was considerably broader than the 1933 version, possibly to try and influence the departing British to increase the area of the subcontinent to be granted to the new Muslim-majority state of Pakistan. For example, Iran was not under direct British rule, nor was Tukharistan, which equated roughly to Turkestan.

The initial ‘Pakstan’ acrostic quickly evolved into ‘Pakistan’, which had a double meaning. The first meaning was the five part acrostic, as described above. Secondly, in Sindhi, Persian and Urdu, Pakistan’s national language since 1948, ‘Pakistan’ meant ‘land of the pure’. (Urdu is also the official language for Indian J&K and Azad Kashmir.)¹⁸ This referred to a homeland for Muslims in which Muslims would predominate, or, put differently, ‘a country that did not contain people of an impure or a different faith’.¹⁹ The concept of being the ‘land of the pure’ may have been an attempt to slight Hindus, especially high caste Brahmins pursuing spiritual purity in order to obtain liberation or release (*moksha*; *mukti*) from their karmic bonds compelling them to continue to reincarnate in human form. Interestingly, however, there was no ‘b’ for ‘Bengal’ in ‘Pakistan’, which may partly explain why East Pakistan (formerly East Bengal) violently broke away from West Pakistan in 1971 to become Bangladesh. Islam was not strong enough to keep these two ethnically disparate and culturally diverse wings together, despite the supposed unanimity and strength of the Muslim *ummah*

(community). Ultimately, Bengali nationalism, enflamed by West Pakistani excesses, exploitation and disinterest, was more powerful than Bengalis' distant Islamic connections with West Pakistanis. This reflects—indeed, it confirms—the circumstance that there was/is no such thing as a religious monolith, Islamic or otherwise. Even before the British withdrawal from the Indian subcontinent in 1947, some Muslims understood this circumstance and perceived a separate homeland for Bengali Muslims called Bang-i-Islam (Islam in Bengal). They hoped that, post-1947, this eastern entity would join with the Muslim-dominated nations of Pakistan and Usmanistan (an independent Hyderabad named after its Muslim ruler) and form a triple alliance.²⁰

In their early days, proponents of Pakistan anticipated that the forthcoming nation on the Indian subcontinent for Muslims would be much bigger than the 'moth-eaten' Pakistan that they finally secured. (This label was given to Pakistan by its founder, Muhammad Ali Jinnah.) Their anticipation may have reflected a bargaining stance—it was not completely certain until early to mid-1947 that the British would partition India and create Pakistan. Indeed, the British only publicly announced their partition plan on 3 June 1947. This division of the subcontinent would create a different entity from the Pakistan entity envisaged in the early 1940s that future Pakistanis hoped would, and believed should, comprise all of the (undivided) British-administered provinces that contained Muslim-majority populations. For Jinnah, this envisaged nation would include the entire—and undivided—provinces of Baluchistan, NWFP, Punjab, Sindh and Bengal. This territory included the important mercantile city of Calcutta and the Sikh's major religious city of Amritsar. Opportunistically, some Muslims also wanted to obtain other areas with significant Muslim-minority populations, for example, Assam, plus a corridor across northern India to link the two wings of Pakistan. They wanted this corridor to go via historic Muslim areas such as the former Mughal capital of Delhi; the Shia-dominant former princely state of Oudh; the Muslim-majority princely state of Rampur; and Patna, the capital for Sher Shah Suri, who had caused, and ruled through, Humayan's fifteen-year exile in Persia. Conversely, even though it was desired, proponents of Pakistan did not often mention Muslim-majority J&K as this was a princely state beyond the direct control and administration of the British, the fate of which was to be determined by the Maharaja of J&K. Jinnah's claim was ambitious. Condescendingly, some of his opponents, including Muslims, called his envisaged state 'Jinnahstan'.

Although the term 'land of the pure' was possibly a slight to esoteric or 'other-worldly' Hindus, many of these non-Muslims in India, both politicians and princes, were actively contemplating worldly post-World War II matters for the subcontinent. Led by the Congress Party, Indian politicians were thinking about the creation of a secular India in the wake of the inevitable British withdrawal. This India might comprise either a federation or a unitary state in which some electoral compensation might be made for the large Muslim minority that then comprised about a third of all Indians under British and princely control. Certainly, the Congress hope was that India would remain united, although most realists accepted by early 1947 that British India would be divided. It was important that they secure the largest possible India and the smallest possible Pakistan. For Congress, this included agreeing to the partition of Punjab and Bengal provinces. As for India's princes, most comprised Hindus, with a smaller number of Sikh and Muslim rulers. In 1947, these various rulers nervously and somewhat indecisively were contemplating their post-British status. Many, such as the rulers of Hyderabad, J&K and Travancore, harboured a hope that their states could/would become independent. By early 1947, however, and certainly by the time that they left India, the British had made it clear to the princes that 'PrinCEstan' would not happen. Each ruler would have to choose to join India or Pakistan. Each would need to make an accession.

While the future of the princely states was initially uncertain, proponents of Pakistan hoped that

Muslim-majority princely states within, or adjacent to, their envisaged new nation would join it. This included some large princely states such as Bahawalpur, J&K and Kalat. Equally, Jinnah sought to woo princely states with Muslim rulers that were distant from the envisaged Pakistan, such as Hyderabad and Bhopal, to join the new state being created for Muslims. If they felt unwilling or unable to join Pakistan, he encouraged these rulers and other non-Muslim rulers, such as Baroda, Indore and Travancore, to seek independence in order to make India as small as possible. Jinnah also sought to entice some Hindu-majority princely states to join Pakistan by offering each ruler a 'blank cheque': the Hindu prince could name his own terms to accede to Pakistan. The most important was the large princely state of Jodhpur, which feasibly could have joined Pakistan to which it was contiguous. Securing Jodhpur for India was apparently a close run thing, with its Hindu ruler only agreeing to join India a week or so before 15 August 1947. This followed some significant concessions made by the Indian Government and some serious pressure by India's last Viceroy, Lord Louis Mountbatten. Had Jodhpur acceded to Pakistan, nearby princely states such as Jaisalmer, which also was contiguous with Pakistan, and Udaipur and Jaipur, which were contiguous with Jodhpur, may have felt able to join Pakistan. These would have been serious losses for India.

For pre-partition proponents of Pakistan, Kashmir was very important, particularly given that the 'k' in the acrostic 'Pakistan' stood for 'Kashmir'. Without obtaining this Muslim-majority princely state, they considered that Pakistan would be incomplete. While desirous of obtaining all of J&K, proponents of Pakistan wanted most of all to secure the famed and famous Kashmir Valley, where 93 per cent of residents were Muslims. Conversely, these proponents either had not considered or did not realise that four districts of J&K's eastern Jammu Province (Chenani Jagir, Jammu, Kathua, Udhampur) and the south-eastern Ladakh Tehsil of the Ladakh District in the Frontier Districts Province respectively had strongly Hindu and Buddhist majority populations. These J&K-ites, particularly Hindus in Jammu and Kathua, were strongly pro-India and placating them would be difficult. A partition of J&K along religious lines may have been one way to resolve this matter, although few, if any people, proposed this option in 1947 for J&K. This was chiefly because the issue at that time was clearly about whether the Maharaja of J&K, whose decision it was, would unite his princely state, in its entirety, with India or Pakistan. Seemingly, proponents of Pakistan overlooked this simple fact: that Pakistan could only obtain J&K if its ruler acceded to Pakistan. Few, if any, had consulted Maharaja Hari Singh about whether he wanted his state to be included in Pakistan—let alone his thoughts about Kashmir being included in the acrostic Pakistan itself. On both counts, Hari Singh clearly was reluctant. Given that the British would play no direct part in determining J&K's international future, for Pakistan to obtain the J&K ruler's accession, Hari Singh needed to be wooed, cajoled or threatened. Indians had been contemplating such factors since at least the fourth quarter of 1946; proponents of Pakistan had seemingly ignored them. When it came to genuinely wooing the ruler of J&K, proponents of Pakistan did a poor job.

In a portent of future India-Pakistan antagonism, both new dominions did not celebrate receiving their freedom concurrently. While there were mainly logistical reasons for this, there also was a small degree of one-upmanship, with Pakistan appearing to obtain its freedom first. However, the Indian Independence Act stated that 'As from the fifteenth day of August, nineteen hundred and forty-seven, two independent Dominions shall be set up in India, to be known respectively as India and Pakistan'.²¹ To enable the last Viceroy, Mountbatten, to participate in celebrations in both 'independent Dominions', Pakistan celebrated 14 August as its 'independence' day, while India celebrated 15 August for this event. Each dominion obtained full and final independence after effecting its own constitution on its respective 'Republic Day': 26 January 1950 for India; 23 March

1956 for Pakistan. Before then, both dominions operated under the Indian Independence Act 1947 and the Government of India Act 1935,²² with amendments made in 1947. This meant that, while they were autonomous and self-governing entities, they still had a formal link to the United Kingdom via a Governor-General. This official was always a local, except for Lord Mountbatten, who transferred from being Viceroy and Governor-General of British India to being the first Governor-General of India. He served in this role from August 1947 to June 1948. A piqued Mountbatten had also hoped to serve concurrently as Pakistan's Governor-General, but Jinnah took that role.

At the time of partition in 1947, many Indians felt, and hoped, that Pakistan would not last long and that, sooner rather than later, it would fall apart and be re-absorbed into India. However, apart from the 'loss' of its eastern wing in 1971 when East Pakistan became the independent nation of Bangladesh, the area that now comprises Pakistan has shown remarkable resilience dealing with the many problems that it has confronted since 1947. Six decades later, few Indians still talk of Pakistan's demise and, even those who do, are probably no longer interested in re-absorbing the currently troubled Islamic nation of Pakistan and its population into India. Conversely, many Pakistanis still consider that many Indians do not accept the existence of Pakistan. This is a fallacy. Most Indians long ago accepted Pakistan's existence. Furthermore, given its current parlous political and economic shape, few Indians would want to re-absorb Pakistan into India, except possibly those in favour of 'Akhand Bharat', an undivided greater India as it existed under the British. This concept is popular with some right-wing Hindus, but with few other Indians.

With the British departure in 1947, the Indian Independence Act also made it clear that British suzerainty over, and obligations in relation to, all princely states lapsed.²³ As a result, these states, including J&K, theoretically were independent. Nevertheless, this Act also allowed 'the accession of Indian States to either of the new Dominions'.²⁴ On 25 July 1947, three weeks before departing India, the chief British representative in India, the Viceroy, Lord Mountbatten, had addressed the Chamber of Princes and encouraged all princely rulers to accede to India or Pakistan. Both London and Mountbatten also made it clear that, after the British withdrew from India, the United Kingdom Government would only deal with these two new independent dominions, not with any rulers of princely states. Mountbatten was in a powerful position, having previously been given almost full autonomy to negotiate a deal that would free Britain from India by June 1948, at the latest. (In a hurry, he pro-actively advanced this exit date to 15 August 1947, which coincided with anniversary of the Japanese Army's surrender to him in 1945.) The future leaders of India and Pakistan generally also expected each prince to make an accession to one or the other dominion, although Jinnah was more ambivalent on this point, stating that princely rulers were free to join Pakistan, India or remain independent. Jinnah took this stance partly because he hoped some princely states would choose to be independent, thus weakening post-British India. He may also have believed that, in time, either India or Pakistan would absorb or subsume all princely states, as it would be impossible for any one princely state to stand alone and survive.

In deciding their accession, the British supposedly encouraged the autocratic princes to take account of their state's geography and the wishes of their people. While people under British control were euphoric about obtaining freedom from the British, few subjects in princely states had any expectation that their ruler would consult them about his accession. Ultimately, the rulers alone were to decide this issue; their subjects had no say in the matter. By 15 August 1947, all except five princely states geographically contiguous to India had signed an 'Instrument of Accession' or made their future intentions clear. These five comprised Hyderabad, Jammu and Kashmir, Junagadh, Manavadar and Mangrol. The latter three were located in the Kathiawar peninsula region. Rulers of

princely states who wanted to join Pakistan could only accede to it after Pakistan legally came into existence in 15 August 1947. Rulers who joined their princely states with Pakistan were Amb, Bahawalpur, Chitral, Dir, Kalat, Khairpur, Kharan, Las Bela, Makran and Swat. All had done so, or had been forced to do so in the case of Kalat, by March 1948.

Two significant and controversial accessions involving Junagadh and Hyderabad set precedents to enable India and Pakistan to engage in duplicity, double standards and diatribes in relation to what was to become the Kashmir dispute. The Nawab of Junagadh and the Nizam of Hyderabad were Muslim rulers of Hindu-majority states, which was the reverse situation to Maharaja Hari Singh, who was the Hindu ruler of a Muslim-majority state. Junagadh was considered the 'premier' princely state in the Kathiawar peninsula, comprising 3,337 sq. miles and a population of 671,000 people, of whom 80 per cent were Hindus.²⁵ Surrounded on land by Indian territory, Junagadh was close to Pakistan, but not contiguous with it, although Pakistan was accessible by sea from Junagadh's coastline. The Nawab, somewhat surprisingly, acceded to Pakistan on 18 August 1947. Despite Junagadh's Hindu-majority population, (Muslim) Pakistan readily accepted the Nawab's accession, which act was unpopular with his subjects. After Congress members of the local assembly, supported by India, repudiated the accession, then sought to govern Junagadh, the Nawab quickly fled to Karachi. Indian forces entered the state on 9 September 1947 'in response to a request by the Junagadh Executive Council, the Pakistani Government being informed of this action'.²⁶ On 1 October 1947, a provisional government established itself in Junagadh. In February 1948, a 'popular' vote organised by India overturned the Nawab's accession and Junagadh formally joined India. The conducting of a plebiscite in Junagadh essentially ended the issue of this state's international status: it was now with India. Nevertheless, an indignant Pakistan continued to claim—and still claims—this former princely state. Indeed, on Pakistani maps, Pakistan still shows 'Junagadh and Manavadar' as being Pakistani territory.²⁷ Manavadar was a small Second Division, Hindu-majority princely state that Junagadh joined on three sides and which was ruled by a Muslim who was a relative of the Nawab of Junagadh. The Khan of Manavadar acceded to Pakistan in 1947 at the same time as his relative. The resolution of the international status of his state was determined using a similar process as that used for Junagadh. Nearby Mangrol, whose ruler was partially under Junagadh's control and who initially joined India then sought to join Pakistan, suffered a similar fate. Along with Junagadh, these two areas became integral parts of India. For Pakistan, accepting such accessions had been opportunistic, at best. For India, 'it was intolerable that pockets of Pakistan should be created within Indian territory'.²⁸ While possibly so, India nevertheless found itself having to accommodate over fifty East Pakistan/ Bangladesh enclaves located within eastern India, while more than 100 Indian enclaves were wholly located within East Pakistan/ Bangladesh. This still unresolved issue was the direct result of the accession of the patchwork princely states of Cooch Behar to India and Rangpur to (East) Pakistan in 1947.

The Junagadh situation created some interesting and dangerous precedents in relation to J&K's later accession to India. First, (Muslim) Pakistan's ready acceptance of the (Muslim) Nawab's accession of his Hindu-majority state later enabled (secular) India to readily accept a similar, but reversed, situation: the accession of the (Hindu) Maharaja of Muslim-majority J&K to India. Second, India did not recognise the Nawab's accession and sought to reverse the situation, as Pakistan would later do in relation to the Maharaja of J&K's accession to India. Third, India used force to enter Junagadh, as Pakistan would later do in J&K. Fourth, India enabled a popular vote, or plebiscite, to allow the people of Junagadh to resolve their contentious accessional situation, something it later

promised for J&K, but never actively tried to deliver. Fifth, the creation of a Provisional Council in Junagadh later inspired rebellious Muslims in Poonch to create a similar body in an area of J&K that they had liberated from the Maharaja's control that came to be called Azad Kashmir. Neither India nor Pakistan involved the United Nations in the Junagadh dispute. Both dominions considered their positions to be legally and morally justified. Equally, compared with J&K, Junagadh was not a big prize worth fighting over. Increasingly, it became clear that Pakistan had been opportunistic in accepting the Nawab's accession. The people of Junagadh clearly were pro-India. The princely state was physically inaccessible by Pakistan, which meant that this dominion could do little to actually secure or defend what supposedly was Pakistani territory. This contrasted with J&K, with which Pakistan was contiguous, where a fair proportion of the people of J&K in 1947 had strong inclinations to join Pakistan, and where Pakistan could do something physically to secure this state for Pakistan.

The situation in Hyderabad was different from Junagadh as the Nizam of Hyderabad appeared to want independence for his princely state, rather than to join India or Pakistan. In 1947, this large, populous, wealthy and prestigious entity ruled by a Muslim had a population of ten million. Over 85 per cent of these people, however, were Hindus. It was highly desirable for India to obtain the Nizam's accession. Strategically, this was feasible, and likely, as Hyderabad was totally surrounded by Indian territory. For the same reason, this made independence or joining Pakistan untenable. Hyderabad's land-locked situation might have changed had the Nizam, who apparently desired to procure Goa from the Portuguese, obtained this seaport. Nevertheless, to access Goa, the Nizam would have needed to secure an easement across Indian territory from Hyderabad to India's west coast. India was unlikely to grant this. For its part, Pakistan, which had received a loan from the wealthy Nizam, was unable to assist the geographically isolated princely state of Hyderabad in any physical way. Karachi could only encourage the Nizam to pursue independence for Usmanistan, thereby hopefully depriving India of a potential gain. Apart from the geographic challenge, Hyderabad also realised that independence was unacceptable to the British or to the Indians. The evidence was there. In 1947, the ruler of the populous and prestigious Travancore princely state in south India, who was entitled to receive a 19-gun salute, the second highest military salvo for an Indian ruler, had tried to pursue becoming independent shortly before the British withdrawal. Three factors quickly changed his mind: internal agitations; the threat of military action by India; and, the total lack of British support for any post-British political entities except India and Pakistan.

The Nizam, in a growing sign of the realities of his strategic situation and of his people's desire for India, and possibly after India applied some economic pressure by withholding supplies, signed a Standstill Agreement with India in November 1947. Under the arrangements in place in 1947, such an agreement allowed a dominion to continue to provide services to a princely state while its ruler decided his accession. This gave the Nizam time to think and negotiate. Negotiations broke down in June 1948, partly because the Nizam overestimated his situation by believing that India and its armed forces were heavily distracted dealing with events in J&K. Following significant, large-scale civil unrest in mid-1948, the Indian Army took action in September 1948. It captured the princely state, after which Hyderabad was quickly incorporated into India. Again, double standards abounded. First, India did not accept the ruler's right to decide the accession, whereas it had for J&K. Second, India used economic power against Hyderabad, after having castigated Pakistan for doing so against J&K. Third, India used force, after it had condemned Pakistan for doing so in J&K. Fourth, India, which seemed to have learned a lesson with J&K, did not talk of conducting a plebiscite to determine the political aspirations of the people of Hyderabad. Fifth, Pakistan was happy for the Nizam to decide

his state's international status without any reference to the people but it rejected this approach for J&K. In 1948 and 1949, the United Nations Security Council discussed the 'Hyderabad question', but without reaching any resolution. Clearly, Hyderabad was within India's physical, political and emotional domain, which effectively ended the matter. Nevertheless, in 2010, Hyderabad remained on the 'list of matters of which the Security Council is seized' even though UNSC had not discussed the matter since 24 May 1949.²⁹

As noted, by 15 August 1947, Maharaja Sir Hari Singh, the ruler of J&K, was one of the few rulers of a major princely state who had not made an accession. The fourth and, as it turned out, final Dogra ruler of J&K faced a major dilemma. Because of his state's size, prestige and international borders, independence was the option that he favoured. Singh may even have harboured ideas of creating an independent 'Dograistan' that would include J&K, Kangra, east of Kathua, and some of the princely states of the Punjab hills to Kangra's south-east. (Importantly, J&K's leading Kashmiri politician, Sheikh Abdullah, also favoured independence for J&K, although he first wanted to get rid of Dogra rule, then determine the state's future.) Apart from reasons of prestige, being an independent state theoretically would have allowed the Maharaja to continue his autocracy. After August 1947, however, Hari Singh increasingly became anachronistic, as did most princely rulers, except those who went into politics. Most princes had not moved with the times by converting themselves into popular administrators running robust economies, empowering their subjects, and able to withstand losing the unequivocal, often uncritical, British support that had nurtured and protected their regimes. Nor had many princes developed effective ways in which their subjects could participate in political processes, share power, or consult on a potential accession. Additionally, the British had tried to use the princes after World War II as a 'loyal counter-weight to [Indian] nationalism' and forces wanting Indian independence.³⁰ Princely rivalry, disunity and relative backwardness made this option difficult. Conversely, for the princes, supporting the British did not endear them to those Indians living in British India who were to take over the running of the bulk of the subcontinent's post-British affairs. This was particularly so for Hari Singh who had 'bad blood' with Nehru after imprisoning the Indian politician in June 1946.

Maharaja Hari Singh faced other dilemmas. He was the Hindu ruler of a princely state with a 77 per cent Muslim-majority population. Almost all of J&K's important geographic, economic, transport, social and cultural links were with areas that had become Pakistan. These links were to Rawalpindi, the major town and railhead to which the Kashmir Valley sent goods and from which it drew most supplies; to Sialkot, which town played a similar role for nearby Jammu town and Jammu Province beyond; to Jhelum town, the major collection and distribution point for timber, one of J&K's major exports, much of which was floated down the Jhelum River; to northern NWFP, with which the Gilgit area had economic and social links; and, to the port of Karachi, which was the closest seaport for J&K imports and exports. (Conversely, J&K's only physical link with areas that had become India was the road from Kathua, in far south-eastern Jammu, to Pathankot, in northern Indian Punjab.) Additionally, three major rivers—the Indus, the Jhelum (which partly acted as the border between J&K and Pakistan) and the Chenab—either rose in J&K (Jhelum, Chenab) and/or flowed through it (Indus) to Pakistan. These rivers were potentially important for the generation of hydro-electricity (hydel) and, even more importantly, for the irrigation of the fertile, but relatively scarce, arable Pakistani lands downstream. (Pakistan is largely arid or semi-arid, apart from the fertile Indus River strip that runs down the middle of the nation.) All these reasons suggested that J&K should join Pakistan and that an accession to India would be economically difficult and probably unpopular with many Muslims.

Had Maharaja Hari Singh decided to accede to Pakistan before the British departed on 15 August 1947, the influential and powerful Sardar Patel had made it known, via the British, that India would not consider such an accession to be an unfriendly act.³¹ In other words, before the British withdrawal, India would have accepted the entire princely state of Jammu and Kashmir becoming part of the future Pakistan. This may have been a grudging acceptance; equally, it reflected the admission of a possible reality. Such Indian magnanimity, however, changed quickly after the British, and their influence, departed the subcontinent. Importantly, Patel may have changed his mind about accepting J&K's accession when Pakistan accepted the accession of the Nawab of Junagadh on 18 August 1947. If it was good enough for Karachi to accept the accession of a state whose ruler and the majority of his subjects had differing religions, then it was good enough for New Delhi to do likewise. Additionally, Junagadh was surrounded by Indian territory, while J&K at least had a land border with India.

Maharaja Hari Singh's dilemma was further complicated because, in a straight choice between joining India or Pakistan, the desire of the majority of his subjects was unclear. Although the accession decision was his alone, the Maharaja was remote, autocratic and unpopular with most of his subjects and their political leaders, many of whom he had jailed at various times. He also had not impressed some of his officials, one of whom tellingly stated in 1929 on resigning from Singh's bureaucracy on moral grounds because of the ruler's excesses that the Muslims of J&K were 'absolutely illiterate, labouring under poverty and ... [were] practically governed like dumb driven cattle'.³² Little improved thereafter for this majority grouping of J&K subjects. It therefore would have been difficult in 1947 for the Maharaja to 'carry' the 'peoples' of J&K—the state's diverse and disparate residents have never comprised a homogenous or unified 'people'—on the accession and deliver J&K, in its entirety, to either India or Pakistan, as was required and expected of him. Indeed, after the British withdrawal, people in J&K increasingly were identifying with their dominion of desire and were hopeful, even expectant, that J&K would soon join it. Because the people of J&K have never been asked or polled on their desires for J&K's international status, it is impossible to definitely state whether the majority of J&K-ites desired India or Pakistan as 'their' new state in 1947. Certainly, for religious reasons, many, possibly most, J&K Muslims wanted J&K to join Muslim Pakistan, with which perception Pakistan agreed. Indeed, some Pakistanis believed that Hari Singh wanted to accede to India but hadn't as he was fearful of the pro-Pakistan aspirations of J&K's Muslim-majority population. Conversely, most non-Muslims, who mainly comprised Hindus, as well as J&K's small populations of Buddhists and Sikhs, wanted J&K to join India. Two leading Kashmiri Hindu Pandits were notable exceptions. Both considered that J&K should join Pakistan because of the state's religious composition and its economic and geographical links with this dominion. One was Ramchandra Kak, the Prime Minister of J&K until he was dismissed on 11 August 1947, probably because of his position on the accession. A second was Prem Nath Bazaz, a leading Kashmiri politician later jailed by India.

There was an important 'wildcard' in relation to the accession. Some, perhaps many, Kashmiri Muslims, whose community was the largest and most homogenous in J&K, did not want to join Pakistan. Indeed, given a choice of two options only (that is, without the 'third option' of independence, or *azadi*), Kashmiri Muslims probably favoured joining secular India over joining Islamic Pakistan. The popular and charismatic Sheikh Abdullah led the Kashmiris. Whilst a Muslim, he was leader of the secular National Conference, an ally of the Indian National Congress and a strong rival of the pro-Pakistan Muslim Conference, which party was largely based in Jammu Province. Abdullah disliked the Maharaja and his autocratic rule of J&K, as well as Muhammad Ali

Jinnah, the aloof and somewhat arrogant leader of the Muslim League and founder of Pakistan. Abdullah also perceived (correctly) that feudal elements would dominate Pakistan, thus stifling the National Conference's reform agenda. This included serious land and agrarian reform (which his government 'groundbreakingly' undertook in Indian J&K in 1950, enabling 700,000 cultivators to acquire up to 22.75 acres of land each).³³ Conversely, India's first Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, strongly supported and encouraged Abdullah and his secular Kashmiris, although Nehru was somewhat blinded by his strong emotional attachment to the Kashmir Valley from which his forebears had moved to Delhi around 1716, and by his strong friendship with Abdullah since the late 1930s. As Nehru told Begum Abdullah in June 1947: 'Nothing that can happen can break these strong bonds that tie me to Kashmir and its people, and their welfare will ever remain a first priority with me'.³⁴ This attitude impaired Nehru's ability to analyse the Kashmir dispute dispassionately. He considered that the National Conference's pro-India leanings, which were strong in the Kashmir Valley, represented the aspirations of many of J&K's Muslim population. This perception was important, given Nehru's post-British power and influence. However, it was false. Many J&K Muslims were strongly pro-Pakistan. Furthermore, on occasions, Abdullah talked of J&K becoming independent, a stance that aligned him with his political rival, Hari Singh, but which later would cause Abdullah's dismissal from office in Indian J&K.

For Maharaja Hari Singh, an accession to Pakistan was personally unpalatable for religious reasons, as it was for many of his Hindu and Buddhist subjects with whom he shared religious affinity as non-Muslims. Pakistan's leader, Jinnah, who had last visited Kashmir in 1944, was seemingly ambivalent about Hari Singh's accession. Jinnah believed—naively, as it turns out—that, because of J&K's geo-economic situation and religious composition, the princely state would fall into Pakistan's 'lap like a ripe fruit'. This would happen once the Maharaja realised his and his people's interests and accordingly acceded to Pakistan.³⁵ Unlike Congress, the Muslim League had previously had little direct interest or involvement in J&K. Jinnah's 1944 visit was the only one made by a senior Muslim League leader before the British withdrawal in 1947. To induce Hari Singh, Jinnah was prepared to offer the ruler a 'blank cheque' for his accession. Possibly, Jinnah was optimistic that J&K would join Pakistan after the J&K Government agreed a Standstill Agreement with the Pakistan Government just before 15 August 1947. (The J&K Government also approached India, but it was non-committal, probably because India then supplied few services to J&K.) Despite its Standstill Agreement with Pakistan, J&K's dependency on Pakistani Punjab was highlighted in September 1947 when the supply of essential goods and services to J&K, including petrol, wheat and salt, were severely curtailed. This may have been an act of intimidation by Pakistan. Equally, truck drivers were too scared to travel through the highly volatile Punjab region, where great turmoil and bloodshed were occurring, to J&K, where there also was significant volatility and bloodshed in Jammu Province.³⁶ The rest of J&K was calm, although transport to Kashmir Province also involved crossing Punjab. Given the upheaval, chaos, tumult and inter-religious violence occurring in north-western parts of the subcontinent in 1947, particularly after partition, the truck drivers' fear had credibility.

For the Maharaja, an accession to India was also somewhat unpalatable and it was physically difficult. Hari Singh's active dislike, even hatred, of Nehru, India's new leader and his potential 'boss', and vice versa, was a major disincentive for Hari Singh to accede to India. His reluctance changed somewhat after his backers, the British, left India in mid-August, and the stark reality of his political isolation and of his mandatory 'either Pakistan or India' choice set in. Both men's political fortunes also changed during 1947, with the British withdrawal empowering Nehru and weakening

the Maharaja. Vicariously, Nehru's increased standing advantaged Nehru's friend and Hari Singh's old local rival, Sheikh Abdullah. For Hari Singh, an accession to India was also difficult because this dominion was geographically more remote and physically more difficult to access than Pakistan. In 1947, J&K had no rail links with areas of east Punjab that looked like they would become part of India, while land or road access to these areas was poor or, depending on where the final India-Pakistan border ended up being located, non-existent. Pre-partition, the odds also seemed against India obtaining J&K, if only because of the partition precedent in which Muslim-majority areas of British India would become Pakistan. This suggested that princely rulers should do likewise: J&K therefore should join Pakistan. Post-partition, however, the odds of India obtaining J&K improved.

After the British left the subcontinent, two factors increased India's chances of obtaining J&K. The first was the seeming ambivalence, or detachment, of Jinnah, other Pakistanis and members of the J&K Muslim Conference about J&K's fate. Although J&K was certainly a 'ripe fruit', there was no guarantee that it would automatically fall into Pakistan's 'lap'. Pakistanis needed to be more proactive, a factor that they did not fully appreciate at the time. Their lack of intensity in relation to securing J&K was reflected by their local political associate in J&K only coming out clearly in favour of J&K joining Pakistan on 22 July 1947, less than four weeks before the British departure. Before then, the Muslim Conference had publicly favoured J&K being independent, stating that Muslims would 'readily acclaim [the maharaja] as the first constitutional king of a democratic and independent Kashmir'.³⁷ This was probably a ruse ordered by the Muslim League either to deny J&K to India or to enable Pakistan to deal with this matter later. With so much happening in the turbulent subcontinent, almost all senior Pakistani leaders and politicians were busy trying to establish Pakistan and to ensure that this regime survived and functioned. In their defence, Pakistanis also had little spare capacity to focus on J&K and the people there. While Indians also were busy dealing with a vast array of issues in 1947, Pakistanis had the more difficult task. Leaders in both dominions had to deal with housing, feeding and helping enormous numbers of injured, dislocated and distressed refugees, the major and volatile issue of protecting or (increasingly) of disbursing evacuee property to incoming refugees, and with trying to find missing people, mainly women. India, however, was much better off in 1947. It had obtained the more developed central parts of British India; a functioning capital in New Delhi; more ports and large urban areas; control of the two nations' finances (until Mahatma Gandhi's fast in January 1948 ensured that India gave Pakistan its rightful share); more military and naval bases; and, a larger railway network. Pakistan, conversely, comprised two wings, West Pakistan and East Bengal (later East Pakistan), separated by 1,000 miles of Indian territory or a long sea journey; it had to develop a new capital in Karachi, where office space was short; it possessed many marginal and backward tribal areas of the former empire, although it did secure the western and more fertile part of Punjab; and it had to obtain its share of assets from a reluctant Indian Government, then move these to Pakistan. As the successor state to British India, the newly-created independent dominion of India also automatically obtained the seat for 'British India' at the United Nations. Conversely, Pakistan had to apply to join this body. Pakistan obtained UN membership in September 1947, but only after overcoming opposition from Afghanistan, which did not, and still does not, recognise the British-imposed Durand Line border between it and Pakistan. (This is part of Afghanistan's irredentist desire to incorporate Pukhtoon lands formerly under its control into Afghanistan.) In 1947, Pakistanis' distraction, or possibly temporary disinterest in—or, to put it nicely, their inability to focus sufficiently on—J&K ultimately would cost them dearly.

The second factor after the British withdrawal that increased India's chances of obtaining J&K

occurred on 17 August 1947 when the western India-Pakistan border was announced. The British had constituted two formal Boundary Commissions to divide the provinces of Punjab in the west and Bengal in the east into India and Pakistan. Sir Cyril Radcliffe, a senior British jurist, chaired both bodies. Two Muslim League and two Congress appointees assisted him. One Congress appointee, Mehr Chand Mahajan, later became Prime Minister of J&K in mid-October 1947, shortly before the princely state joined India—and possibly to facilitate this act. Given the four subcontinental members' ideological proclivities, they were largely ineffective, a situation that left Radcliffe with the casting vote on most matters. This was problematic as the Britisher's chief attributes for this major cartographical challenge appeared to be his total lack of knowledge of, or interest in, India. Radcliffe had never been to the subcontinent before, nor would he return after he completed his boundary work. Instead, he was a legal 'surgeon' who the British brought to India solely to sever the subcontinent into two independent dominions: India and Pakistan. This 'surgery' was needed because Mountbatten had been unable to break the deadlock between senior Congress and Muslim League leaders about how to share power in the post-British subcontinent. To meet Mountbatten's August deadline of completing both the British withdrawal and the transfer of power, British officials, including Radcliffe, had to act rapidly. His stay in India therefore was brief—from 8 July to 12 August 1947—but immensely significant.

Although the division of the subcontinent seemed the easiest and most prudent option in 1947, neither the departing paramount power nor many of the subcontinent's senior politicians fully envisaged the problems that would ensue as a result of the hasty execution of this decision. The partition of British India provoked a huge transfer of populations, with as many as ten million people moving: six million Hindus and Sikhs to India; four million Muslims to Pakistan. It instigated vicious inter-religious violence and bloodshed, with up to one million people killed. (Exact figures are not known.) Of these victims, women suffered most all, regardless of their community, with an unknown number raped, abducted and/ or killed in both India and Pakistan. Many lost all contact with their families, a tragedy made worse when such women felt disgraced, dishonoured and disinterested in reuniting with their kin. Some, it seems, changed their names and/or religions and made a life in their new community. In his haste, Mountbatten also did not leave sufficient time to focus on the princes, some of whom were prickly and precious, and on their international futures, a factor that caused India and Pakistan great angst, particularly in relation to J&K. Had Mountbatten insisted that Maharaja Hari Singh make his accession before the British departed the subcontinent, the Kashmir dispute may have never arisen. Mountbatten had been to Srinagar for four days in June 1947 and had encouraged Hari Singh to make an accession before 15 August but had not insisted that he do so. Mountbatten was too busy to further compel Singh. More pressingly, to enable the war weary and financially-strapped British to quickly depart India, they needed to rapidly draw the international boundaries for India and Pakistan. Radcliffe was imported to complete this cartographic confabulation.

While the Radcliffe Awards that provided the India-Pakistan borders had been determined by 12 August 1947, they were only revealed on 17 August. Indian and Pakistani leaders had agreed with this arrangement. The delay was because the British, who did most of the cartography, knew that the borders would be contentious, which might have stymied independence celebrations. Supposedly, Radcliffe determined the India-Pakistan borders on the basis of religious composition, with Muslim-majority areas generally going to Pakistan. Possibly, he also took other factors into account, such as geography and the functioning of Punjab Province's extensive, and important, irrigation networks. Nobody knows exactly, as Radcliffe never explained or discussed his methods and decisions. The Awards had at least three major anomalies: most of Gurdaspur District, which overall had a slight

Muslim-majority population, went to India; Ferozepur, a Muslim-majority district with an arsenal and some important irrigation headworks, went to India; and, the Chittagong Hill Tracts in far eastern Bengal went to Pakistan, even though this area had a Buddhist population (who would later cause Bangladesh problems). Another anomaly not of Radcliffe's making was the issue of the fragmented princely states of Cooch Behar and Rangpur which resulted in numerous small enclaves of East Pakistan being in India, and vice versa. South of Punjab, Radcliffe didn't have to demarcate the rest of the western India-Pakistan border as it followed the established borders of princely states such as Bahawalpur, which joined Pakistan, and Bikaner, Jaisalmer and Jodhpur in the Rajputana Agency, which joined India. South of them, the border followed the border between the princely state of Kutch in the east and Sindh Province in the west, which latter area the British had directly controlled. This border went through the Rann of Kutch, a remote and swampy area adjacent to the Arabian Sea between (Indian) Gujarat and (Pakistani) Sindh (that India and Pakistan later would skirmish over in April 1965).

In two areas where the accession was clearly a contentious issue, NWFP and the Sylhet District of Assam, the British conducted polls before partition. Majorities in both areas chose Pakistan, although the results were close. These polls created an important precedent that may have inspired India's leaders to later offer plebiscites to the people of Junagadh and J&K where the international status of their area was also contentious. Congress had desired that NWFP should be part of India. While geographically difficult because (Pakistani) Punjab was located in between, unification with India was politically feasible, particularly as Pakistan itself was to have two eastern and western wings separated by Indian territory. Congress had a strong presence in the Pukhtoon-dominant NWFP, which was heavily influenced by Khan Abdul Gaffar Khan, the so-called 'Frontier Gandhi', and his brother Dr Khan Sahib, a former chief minister. Both men had strong links with senior Congress figures, including Gandhi and Nehru. Ultimately, NWFP was 'lost' through a referendum in July 1947 that Congress boycotted, partly as Gaffer Khan by then favoured an independent Pukhtunistan nation that would unite Pukhtoons in NWFP and south-eastern Afghanistan. The referendum was not an overwhelming vote of support for Pakistan: only 50.49 per cent of eligible NWFP electors voted to join this dominion. There may also have been British connivance in the poll to ensure that it went Pakistan's way.³⁸ In the tea-growing district of Sylhet, 56.6 per cent of people voted to join Pakistan. India did not seem so concerned about this territorial 'loss'. Thereafter, many, but not all, Hindus left the Sylhet area for India.³⁹

(In relation to the India-Pakistan border, it is worth remembering that, from 1947 to 1971, Pakistan comprised two parts separated by a hefty 1,000 miles of Indian territory. People often forget that Pakistan had an eastern wing—which is the correct way to describe this relationship as Pakistan's capital and most of its major administrative and military facilities were located in West Pakistan, and West Pakistanis tended to dominate the nation. Until 1960, Karachi was Pakistan's capital. Following his successful coup in 1958, General Muhammad Ayub Khan moved the capital to Rawalpindi, where the Pakistan Army was headquartered and which, incidentally, was located much closer to J&K. Rawalpindi was Pakistan's capital from 1960–67, after which a new capital was developed from scratch in nearby Islamabad. Dhaka (formerly Dacca) was always the capital of East Pakistan, but never of Pakistan, despite Bengalis being more populous and putting more into the nation economically than West Pakistanis, both of which factors disenchanted Bengalis. Unlike the annual move of the J&K administration from Srinagar to Jammu City, the Pakistani capital did not shift between West and East Pakistan. Although West Pakistanis generally dominated Pakistan, some of Pakistan's Prime Ministers and early interlocutors with India over J&K were actually Bengalis:

Khawaja Nazimuddin (1951–53); Muhammad Ali Bogra (1953–55); and H.S. Suhrawardy (1956–57). Arguably, these men lacked the emotional attachment with J&K that West Pakistanis, such as Ayub Khan and Zulfikar Ali Bhutto had, or that Indians with Kashmiri forebears, such as Jawaharlal Nehru, had. An unofficial subcontinental maxim reflects this phenomenon: the further one is away from J&K, the less important the Kashmir dispute is. In retrospect, the two-winged Pakistan that existed until 1971 was unique, but untenable. Logistically, it was difficult, particularly during times of hostility with India, such as in 1965 when India barred Pakistani flights over Indian territory. Pakistanis then had to travel by sea between Pakistan's two wings. After the 1971 India-Pakistan war, Pakistan came to comprise a strategically more compact, and defensible, space.)

On 17 August 1947, the possibility of J&K joining India improved significantly after the Radcliffe Boundary Commission contentiously awarded India the narrow, and strategic, Gurdaspur land corridor. Fortuitously, this gave J&K a short, but important, border with India. At the corridor's northern end, a road of poor standard connected Kathua, in eastern Jammu Province, with the (then) most northern part of the Dominion of India. In 1947, many refugees used this road as part of a corridor to travel from Sialkot, via Jammu town and Kathua, to Pathankot, or vice versa. An existing railway line that ended in Pathankot town was extendable to Kathua, and beyond into J&K. Somewhat presciently, the J&K Government had announced in July 1947 that it intended to metal the Kathua Road and 'thus connect Jammu State' with India 'through Pathankot'.⁴⁰ Whether this was simply to improve J&K's communications along this increasingly utilised route or it reflected an intention to join India is not known. The Pathankot-Jammu railway took much longer to build, with its completion only occurring in 1971. The award to India of Gurdaspur was significant. Without it, India would have needed to construct new transport links to J&K through difficult terrain in its Punjab foothills (now Himachal Pradesh). This lack of connectivity would have made an accession by Hari Singh to India very difficult in the short term.

Some Pakistanis saw Gurdaspur's allocation to India as a conspiracy: because Gurdaspur District had a 51 per cent Muslim-majority population, it should have been awarded to Pakistan. However, the percentages in three of the district's four tehsils were close: Batala was 53 per cent Muslim; Gurdaspur was 50.5 per cent Muslim; Shakargarh was 51.3 per cent Muslim. Only the fourth tehsil, Pathankot, had a strong majority, although it was 65 per cent Hindu. India obtained all of Gurdaspur's tehsils except Shakargarh, possibly because this tehsil alone was located on the west bank of the Ravi River. Pakistani conspiracy theorists may be correct. Congress leaders, particularly Nehru, had developed a close relationship with Mountbatten and his wife, Edwina, which Pakistanis claim these Indians used to their advantage by getting Mountbatten to 'influence' Radcliffe to create a western border favourable for India. Conversely, Viceroy Wavell had indicated to London as early as February 1946 that Gurdaspur District should go to India for 'geographical reasons'.⁴¹ It was adjacent in the north-east to the Sikh-dominant Amritsar District in which was located the Sikh's holiest shrine, the Golden Temple. Without Gurdaspur District, Amritsar District would have been a vulnerable stub of land that jutted into Pakistan. Possibly, Radcliffe followed Wavell's lead. It is impossible to know. What is known is that, after 17 August 1947, the option of J&K joining India became distinctly feasible.

Hari Singh's vacillation and its effects

So it was in 1947 that Maharaja Hari Singh was required to make a difficult choice that would clearly disenchant many people. Before the British left, Hari Singh had been considered by some to

be 'a great organiser, and very meticulous in everything he did'. Equally, 'he wasn't adequately aware of the [major] changes taking place' in the subcontinent 'and was a bit of a loner', possibly because of the effects of the Mr. A blackmail case.⁴² In 1947, with many people and parties pressuring this ruler who suffered from the 'feudal virus' of indecisiveness, Hari Singh vacillated.⁴³ Persuasive arguments could be made for all three international options that he was considering: independence; uniting with Pakistan; joining India. Somewhat overawed or, more likely, hoping that if he stalled independence might simply eventuate, Hari Singh could not, or would not, make an accession. Any hope that he harboured for independence was utterly unrealistic. This was because, when it came to J&K's future, the general consensus among the British, Indians, Pakistanis, most leading J&K politicians, probably many of the people of J&K, and later the United Nations, was that J&K would, and should, ultimately and in its entirety, join either India or Pakistan. This 'zero sum game' in which one nation would get all of J&K and the other would get nothing would be a significant impediment to resolving the Kashmir dispute for some time.

In trying to determine his accession, Maharaja Hari Singh confronted J&K's greatest problem: the state's perceived indivisibility but its inherent and actual divisibility. Before 15 August 1947, the only force that compelled the people of J&K to cohere was the Maharaja and his autocratic administration, supported almost unconditionally by British paramountcy and, on occasions, by its military forces. Otherwise, the princely state was far from a unified entity. Its residents were diverse, dispersed and disunified. They had ethnic, cultural and social differences, geographical and economic separateness, religious complexity, historical antipathies, and they lacked political unity. Socially, economically and politically, upper caste Dogra Hindus were 'superior' as they benefitted both from being of the same religion and status as their Jamwal Rajput ruler and from some of the perquisites and privileges that this relationship provided. Within J&K's populous Muslim 'community', there were Sunnis, Shias, Maulias (followers of the Aga Khan, also known as Ismailis) and mystical Sufis. The practices of Jammu Sunnis were different from those of the sole group in J&K that enjoyed considerable ethnic and religious homogeneity, Sunni Kashmiri Muslims, many of whom happily engaged in local traditions such as shrine worship which was anathema to more 'fundamentalist' Sunnis. Politically, neither of J&K's two major political parties enjoyed universal appeal. The National Conference appealed to Kashmiris, both Muslim and Hindu; the Muslim Conference was popular with Jammu Muslims; both parties had little presence in the large, remote and lightly-populated Frontier Districts Province. Furthermore, since the construction of the political entity of J&K in 1846, the four autocratic Dogra Maharajas who had ruled it had failed—if they had tried at all—to endear themselves to many of their compelled and exploited subjects. These Dogras had not empowered the people of J&K politically, nor had they fostered or developed any strong or fraternal feelings amongst 'their' people of being citizens of a unified J&K entity. In making his accession, therefore, Maharaja Hari Singh had minimal political capital, little popularity and no sense of mutual obligation or shared citizenship on which he could draw, or to which he could appeal, for support.

Hari Singh's difficulties were compounded when the paramount power progressively withdrew itself and its support, including military assistance, from the subcontinent. This process was largely completed by 15 August 1947. Thereafter, J&K found itself on its own. Increasingly, its armed forces and police were unable to control the princely state's restive population, particularly pro-Pakistan Muslims in Jammu Province and around Gilgit town, and Hindus and Sikhs in eastern Jammu Province. As a result, J&K quickly fragmented. In the period between 15 August and 26 October 1947, people in J&K took three significant actions that politically and physically divided J&K and instigated the continuing dispute over the state's international status: a Muslim anti-Maharaja uprising

in Poonch; significant inter-religious violence in Jammu Province; and, the creation of Azad Kashmir in the areas of Jammu Province that the pro-Pakistan Muslims 'liberated'. These three actions occurred before Hari Singh's accession to India on 26 October 1947 and before either dominion, or its military forces, had officially entered J&K. India and Pakistan have completely overlooked or ignored these three significant undertakings. Nevertheless, the people of J&K's actions divided the princely state and actually instigated the dispute over its international status. The people of Jammu and Kashmir therefore began the Kashmir dispute and not outsiders, as India claims, a claim in which Pakistan surprisingly has acquiesced.⁴⁴

The schedule of the people's three actions in J&K that took place in the uncertain period immediately after the British withdrawal from India is as follows. First, after 15 August 1947 (or from June 1947, or even from as early as February 1947), Muslims in the Poonch Jagir area of western Jammu Province, at least 50,000 of whom had acquired military experience serving in the British Indian Army during World War II, staged a 'no tax' campaign. This quickly developed into a fully-fledged anti-Maharaja uprising. The Poonchis were inspired by their dislike of Hari Singh and his overbearing regime. In particular, Muslim Poonchis were disenchanted as J&K State Forces sought to brutally control and disarm them. They disliked these forces' efforts to suppress their strong desire for J&K to join neighbouring Pakistan. They became dismayed as these forces redistributed some of their surrendered arms to local Hindus and Sikhs. The anti-Maharaja Muslim rebels soon congregated into a ragged militia that opposed the J&K State Forces, with some success. They were joined by Muslims in the neighbouring Mirpur District, by other pro-Pakistan people in Kashmir opposed to Hari Singh, and by J&K-ites returning home from mainland India-Pakistan either following the end of temporary work undertaken during warmer months and/ or due to the upheavals associated with partition and/or to support the local pro-Pakistan cause. The J&K Government accused Pakistan and its army of helping the rebels. The Indian Government believed that people in border areas of Pakistan were helping the anti-Maharaja rebels. The Azad Kashmir Government did admit that there had been a 'very small percentage of Pakistani volunteers ... fight[ing] alongside the Azad Forces'.⁴⁵ Pakistan refuted India's accusations of Pakistani soldiers being involved in J&K by claiming, reasonably truthfully at that stage, that any such personnel were soldiers from J&K who had returned home on leave. Pakistan counter claimed that Hindus and Sikhs from J&K were crossing into Pakistan and attacking Pakistanis in border areas. In such turbulent times, Pakistan's claim also was possible.

Second, in September–October 1947, serious inter-religious violence took place in Jammu Province. Protagonists generally sought, often violently, to ensure that J&K joined their nation of choice. Some opportunistically killed members of the opposite religious community to settle scores. Others took advantage of the upheaval for their own nefarious purposes. In the Hindu-majority areas of eastern Jammu Province, pro-India Hindus and Sikhs killed a large number of Muslims in what amounted to a form of religious 'cleansing' for political ends. Their efforts were boosted by the stories and actions of agitated, even 'frenzied', Hindus and Sikhs traversing from Punjab, through Jammu Province, to India. A popular land route ran from Sialkot, through Jammu town, to Pathankot, with nearly 60,000 Hindu 'Dogras and Sikhs from Gujrat district' having arrived in the Jammu area in mid-September 1947 via this route.⁴⁶ The Maharaja and his forces may have been involved in some of the bloodletting in eastern Jammu. So too possibly were members of the right-wing Hindu Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (National Self-Service Society) and Sikhs from eastern Punjab, particularly the princely state of Patiala, whose influential ruler had a close relationship with Hari Singh and who may have provided him with some troops and arms. One correspondent suggested that

as many as 237,000 Muslims were either ‘exterminated’ or forced to flee the Jammu area in 1947.⁴⁷ Perhaps between 20,000 and 100,000 Muslims were killed in Jammu Province in 1947, although considerably further research is needed to confirm what some call ‘the Jammu massacre’.⁴⁸ These figures also did not include rapes, abductions and serious injuries. Certainly, a large number of Jammu Muslims, around 400,000, also fled to Pakistan or to the newly-formed Azad Kashmir, which had about 150,000 refugees. When these people left their homes in J&K, many thought that they were leaving temporarily and that they would soon return when the situation in J&K and the subcontinent normalised. Few of these refugees ever returned home.

While the violence against Muslims in eastern Jammu Province was alarming, Muslims in western parts of the province concurrently engaged in similar diabolical acts. In Mirpur District and the Poonch Jagir, Muslims killed large numbers of Hindus and Sikhs, raped and/or abducted females, or forced non-Muslims to flee either to Hindu-dominant parts of Jammu Province or to India. By 1951, of the former approximately 114,000 non-Muslims who in 1941 had lived in areas that later came to comprise Azad Kashmir—that is, 89 per cent of Mirpur District, 87 per cent of Muzaffarabad District and 60 per cent of Poonch Jagir—only a paltry 790 non-Muslims remained.⁴⁹ This was out of a total Azad Kashmir population in 1951 of 886,000. We don’t know how many Hindus and Sikhs were actually killed. One (unverifiable) source suggests that, after Azad Kashmir forces captured Mirpur in November 1947, ‘not less than 20,000 [non-Muslim] citizens of Mirpur ... lost their lives, about 2500 were captured by the enemy and the remaining about 2500 migrated to different parts of India’.⁵⁰ Many Hindus from Mirpur and Muzaffarabad not killed became internally displaced people within J&K, although, to their chagrin, the Indian J&K Government has never formally granted them this status, nor the associated benefits or special privileges for having endured ‘forced’ re-location.

In 1947, all religious communities suffered in Jammu Province (and in northern parts of India and Pakistan). The only bright spots in this period of death and destruction were that, pre-accession, there was almost no inter-religious violence in Kashmir Province or in the Frontier Districts Province. Both regions had overwhelming Muslim majorities whose members felt personally secure, while there were few non-Muslim residents willing or able to unify and agitate in support of J&K joining India. Another factor is that, in the Frontier Districts Province, its largest minority comprising Ladakhi Buddhists generally lived separately from Muslims in the Ladakh Tehsil of Ladakh District, where Buddhists comprised an overwhelming majority.

In Jammu Province, the hostile actions against Muslims in eastern Jammu further incited Muslims in Poonch and neighbouring Muslims in Mirpur District to oppose the Hindu ruler and fight for J&K to join Pakistan. Apart from pursuing this political aspiration, some Muslims felt that they were fighting for their actual lives. Hari Singh’s vacillation, coupled with rumours that he was preparing to accede to India, inspired these pro-Pakistan elements to take a third action. In early October 1947, some rebellious but uncertain Muslims, possibly inspired by events in Junagadh, weakly attempted to establish a government in an area that they had liberated from Hari Singh’s control. Their attempt failed. At a second attempt on 24 October 1947, more determined Muslims successfully established a so-called ‘provisional government’. This occurred two days after a *lashkar* (army) of Pukhtoon tribesmen from Pakistan had invaded Kashmir Province and possibly stiffened their resolve. A Poonchi lawyer and Muslim Conference member of J&K’s *Praja Sabha* legislature, Sardar Muhammad Ibrahim Khan (Sardar Ibrahim), was the provisional government’s first president. This new ‘administration’, which was far from organised, coherent and fully functioning, was provisional until the people of J&K determined the future of their state. It sought to rule the region that the rebels

called Azad (Free) Jammu and Kashmir. This area was not ‘free’ in the sense of being independent—the people still wanted J&K to join Pakistan. Rather, it was free from the Maharaja’s control. ‘Azad Kashmir’, as this region quickly became known, also claimed to be the true government for all of J&K and its residents. After Maharaja Hari Singh acceded to India two days later on 26 October 1947, Azad Kashmir became ‘free’ from Indian control. It has been so ever since.

The three actions discussed above—the Poonch uprising soon after 15 August 1947, the inter-religious violence throughout Jammu Province in September–October 1947, and the establishment of Azad Kashmir on 24 October 1947—were highly significant. They showed that Maharaja Hari Singh was no longer fully in control of ‘his’ state, an entity that he was expected to deliver, in its entirety, via his accession, to either India or Pakistan. Indeed, when the Maharaja finally acceded to India on 26 October 1947, J&K had already been physically and politically divided as a result of these three actions. For some, this means that the Maharaja no longer had the authority to make his accession as he had ‘been overthrown’, the consequence of which was that his accession ‘was null and void’.⁵¹ Such legal arguments are beyond this book’s scope. What can be said is that, when Hari Singh did finally accede to India on 26 October 1947, essentially under coercion because he needed India’s military assistance to confront the invading Pukhtoos, he had become far less relevant than he had been on 15 August 1947. In August, Hari Singh was still in a powerful position over the accession, which was his exclusively to make. Indeed, people were waiting keenly to see which option he would take. Arguably, this was the only ‘card’ of value that Hari Singh held after the British left India.

Hari Singh played his accession card reluctantly—and poorly. As he pondered his accession, he concomitantly lost power and prestige. Indeed, he increasingly became irrelevant, powerless and ignored as people and politicians took their own actions, including armed ones, to ensure that J&K joined the dominion of their choice and/ or to further their own causes and personal positions. On the pro-Pakistan side of J&K, the Maharaja had no control or influence in western Jammu Province by the time of his accession. On the pro-India side of J&K, he had little actual control among his agitated Hindu and Sikh subjects in eastern Jammu, nor much desire to restrain them from their anti-Muslim activities. In the Kashmir Valley, where people’s political desires were less certain, Singh’s unpopular influence became irrelevant soon after the Pukhtoos brutally invaded Kashmir Province early on 22 October 1947, as a result of which Kashmiri men and women formed a People’s Militia to try and defend themselves and their property. Therefore, when Maharaja Hari Singh acceded to India on 26 October 1947, his standing had diminished significantly. Thereafter, India became ascendant. Amongst other actions, New Delhi sent troops into Kashmir on 27 October 1947 to defend the people against the invading Pukhtoon ‘raiders’. It also started to sideline the Maharaja from any effective role in the administration of ‘his’ supposed state while, concurrently, replacing his ilk with local politicians, chiefly Kashmiris.

Indeed, after, and because, of his accession to India, the exalted Maharaja Lieutenant-General Sir Hari Singh Bahadur, the Brave, became, to all intents and purposes, a former ruler and, increasingly, just another citizen of modern India—Mr Hari Singh, the dispossessed. Never again would the Dogra ruler have great prestige with either India or Pakistan, or significant power in J&K. Indeed, his power and influence would further wane. From 26 October 1947, Hari Singh quickly became superfluous to India, to the Indian J&K administration, and to the dispute over ‘his’ (former) state. New Delhi now had the major commodity that it wanted from Hari Singh: J&K’s political unification with India via his accession. India was now legally and theoretically in charge of the entire former princely state, physically in control of Indian-held parts of the state, and Singh was under the control and tutelage of India’s Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru. The Indian compelled the Maharaja to

include his old enemy, Sheikh Abdullah, and some other National Conference members in an Emergency Administration that governed the Kashmir area from 29 October 1947. This administration was both a parallel body to Hari Singh's administration, which had become ineffectual in Kashmir Province and largely in Jammu Province, as continuing violence there showed, and to the Azad Kashmir government in western J&K. In early November 1947, a further administrative change occurred in J&K when people in the Gilgit area staged an armed uprising and opted for Pakistan. They were motivated by Hari Singh's unpopularity, lack of local control, and by his accession to India. Karachi sent a Pakistan official who then administered this area.

Thereafter, Hari Singh's political demise was rapid. In March 1948, an Interim Government was established to administer all of the areas of J&K under Indian control—which I call Indian J&K. Sheikh Abdullah became its Prime Minister. Reflecting Hari Singh's diminishment, he had only one representative on this body while, concurrently, he was made titular constitutional head of Indian J&K.⁵² In June 1949, the now ineffectual and disenchanted Hari Singh delegated his dwindling authority to his politically inexperienced son, Karan Singh, who was then barely eighteen-years old, who became Regent of J&K, in which position he supposedly ruled on behalf of his (seemingly disinterested) father. The older Dogra then left J&K, never to return, a prospect that may not have overly concerned him, given that he traditionally had spent considerable time outside 'his' state. In November 1952, Maharaja Hari Singh's, and Dogra, rule of J&K were officially terminated. They respectively had lasted 27 years and 106 years. Thereafter, Karan Singh became the constitutional head of state for Indian J&K, in which position the younger Dogra served until 1967. While young, inexperienced and without the same autocratic powers as his father, Karan Singh was neither totally pliant nor without power—as Sheikh Abdullah found to his chagrin when Singh sacked him in 1953. In 1961, Hari Singh, Indian citizen, died in Bombay (now Mumbai), his adopted home where, more than anything, he had enjoyed racing horses. Few outside his family and friends, it seems, missed him.

J&K becomes an international issue

On 22 October 1947, J&K's situation changed dramatically when about 3,000 armed Muslim Pukhtoon tribesmen from NWFP invaded Kashmir Province. Pakistan's position is that it encouraged these tribesmen—who necessarily had to pass through Pakistan-controlled NWFP, which province was contiguous with J&K, then cross Pakistan's international border with J&K, to invade—but that it did not organise them. India's claim is that Pakistan organised, ordered and sent these tribesmen to invade J&K. Either way, because Maharaja Hari Singh had not yet decided his accession, the Pukhtoon invasion marked a serious incident by armed men coming from and through Pakistan into an area clearly outside Pakistan's legal, jurisdictional and actual control. Indeed, because the Pakistani tribesmen crossed Pakistan's eastern international border, their action internationalised the issue of J&K's status. This action also instigated the diplomatic dispute between India and Pakistan over which should obtain J&K—the so-called Kashmir dispute.

The Pukhtoons' intention by invading J&K was either to intimidate Maharaja Hari Singh into acceding to Pakistan or to capture him and his state for Pakistan. Vicariously, it assisted pro-Pakistan forces in Azad Kashmir. Indubitably, the invaders had the support and assistance of the NWFP Government, whose Chief Minister in 1947, Khan Abdul Qayyum Khan, was a Kashmiri from the Baramulla area of J&K. (He also was the elder brother of a later President and Prime Minister of Azad Kashmir, Khan Abdul Hamid Khan.) Given the scarcity of trucks and fuel in 1947, official patronage and approval were needed in order to transport such a large number of armed men from the

tribal areas of western NWFP unhindered across Pakistan, then into J&K. The Pukhtoons probably had the support or ‘blessing’ of some very senior Pakistan officials, including Governor-General Jinnah and Prime Minister Liaquat Ali Khan.⁵³ Jinnah’s position is uncertain, although he may have been engaging in an early example of ‘plausible deniability’: ‘Don’t tell me, so I can truthfully say I don’t know whether Pakistan is involved’. Liaquat almost certainly played an active part organising the first of Pakistan’s proxy efforts in J&K. Certainly, India’s leaders thought that Pakistan was heavily, and officially, involved in what Pakistan called ‘Operation Gulmarg’, its plan to capture Kashmir. This name referred to Gulmarg, a popular hill station in the Kashmir Valley to which J&K-ites and others retreated in summer.

Although the Indians didn’t say so at the time, they were aware beforehand of the Pukhtoons’ plan to invade J&K. This is confirmed by two factors. First, the Indians’ supposedly hastily organised, but actually well-planned and executed, military operation in response to the Pukhtoons’ invasion when Royal Indian Air Force (RIAF) and other commandeered aircraft engaged in an rapid airlift of Indian troops to Srinagar. This military operation began on 27 October 1947, twenty-four hours after New Delhi received the Maharaja’s accession to India. The Indians claimed that the accession itself instigated India’s extraordinarily ‘slick’ and efficient military response, which New Delhi boasted was due to the significant and timely efforts of India’s motivated logisticians and other patriots. Secondly and more pointedly, official correspondence shows that Nehru and Patel knew about the Pukhtoons’ invasion, that Patel had asked India’s Defence Minister, Sardar Baldev Singh, beforehand to send arms and ammunition to J&K, by air if necessary, and that Patel had informed Hari Singh beforehand.⁵⁴ Sheikh Abdullah possibly also knew because of his friendship with Nehru and as a result of his own networks. Azad Kashmiris also knew of the invasion, as their leader, Sardar Ibrahim, was in Muzaffarabad when Muslims in the J&K State Forces deserted, after which they secured the strategic bridge at Domel, near Muzaffarabad, over which the Jhelum Valley Road crossed the Jhelum River. This act facilitated the ongoing advance of the Pukhtoons, who had gathered at Abbottabad, from which there was a road of 50 miles (80 km) to Muzaffarabad, and then on to Srinagar about 111 miles (178 km) further down the Jhelum Valley Road. The bulk of the people of Kashmir Province were initially unaware of the Pukhtoons’ invasion, although word quickly spread that these *kabailis*, as Kashmiris call Afghans/Pukhtoons, were in Kashmir.⁵⁵ (Presumably, *kabaili* is a variation on the term ‘Kabul’, from which city the Afghan Durrani had once ruled Kashmir.) India thereafter publicly, and disingenuously, stated that the Pukhtoon invasion marked the beginning of all anti-Maharaja activities in J&K. This position was palpably false, as previous events discussed above show. Equally false was Pakistan’s attempt to claim that it had no involvement in the Pukhtoons’ invasion.

The Pukhtoons who invaded J&K were possibly inspired by a number of factors. One may have been Hindu-Sikh violence against Muslims in Jammu. The Pukhtoons came to know about such violence from Poonchis, whom the Maharaja had disarmed, when these visitors purchased replacement guns and rifles from arms bazaars located in NWFP’s tribal areas. This is a weak argument, given that the Pukhtoons actually entered Kashmir Province, where there was almost no inter-religious violence in 1947, not Jammu Province, where such violence was significant and brutal, including against Muslims. Plunder was another incentive for the Pukhtoons, with Kashmir considered a wealthy area worthy of ‘exploitation’. For their part, the NWFP and Pakistan governments, supported by some significant local religious leaders (or *pirs*), may have encouraged the unruly Pukhtoons, most of whom were from equally unruly tribal areas, to go to J&K in order ‘to kill two birds with the one stone’: to capture J&K for Pakistan and to distract agitated Pukhtoons from

causing trouble locally by pursuing the creation of Pukhtunistan, a concept to which Pakistan was totally opposed. The plan of Operation Gulmarg appeared to be for the Pukhtoons to capture J&K's summer capital, Srinagar, and the Maharaja in residence there, thereby 'obtaining' his (coerced) accession and the princely state of J&K—or at least its most prized part of Kashmir—for Pakistan. The timing meant that, if the Pukhtoons had been successful, they would have captured the Kashmir Valley before the onset of the severe winter weather and snows that isolated the region from the subcontinent. It then would have been very difficult for India to establish any foothold in this snowbound area, let alone to free it from Pakistani control.

Operation Gulmarg went awry. The chief reason was that the irregular Pukhtoons, while good fighters and skirmishers, were highly, and often brutally, undisciplined soldiers. Immediately after entering J&K on 22 October 1947, they got sidetracked looting, pillaging, plundering, raping and killing, rather than advancing directly to capture Srinagar. These nefarious activities considerably slowed their journey to J&K's summer capital. When the Pukhtoons finally reached Srinagar's outskirts around 27–28 October 1947, sufficient Indian Army forces had secured Srinagar airfield and installed defensive positions to stall the Pukhtoons until further Indian soldiers arrived. The first place that the invaders attacked was Muzaffarabad town, where they looted, raped and killed many non-Muslims who had not fled into the surrounding hills. They did the same in Uri, midway between Muzaffarabad and Baramula, although a small number of J&K State Forces destroyed the iron bridge there and bravely engaged, and further slowed, the advancing tribesmen, with loss of life on both sides. The Pukhtoons then headed for Baramula, the first major town in north-western Kashmir, where they again looted, pillaged and killed members of all communities, including Kashmiri Muslims. Between 400 and 3,000 people were killed and there were many abductions, although Pukhtoons were not necessarily responsible for all violence.⁵⁶ Indisputably, however, those killed included foreigners, including some Roman Catholic nuns and a British colonel. This generated a great fear that, if the Pukhtoons reached Srinagar, many more people, including foreigners, would be killed. For external observers, the killing of J&K-ites was bad enough. The murder of foreigners was unacceptable.

Unlike Jammu Province's little-reported inter-religious violence that only involved subcontinentals as perpetrators and victims, the Baramula violence was well reported, partly because it involved the deaths of foreigners. A number of high-profile international newspapers reported the Pukhtoons' excesses, which reportage India used to its advantage. As a result, these excesses, plus the invasion itself, put Pakistan on the moral, political and diplomatic defensive. Newspapers started to report the violence in Baramula soon after it had occurred. This happened partly because India facilitated the visit of foreign reporters to Baramula, partly because the town itself was accessible being located on the metalled and well-patronised Jhelum Valley Road, and partly because the death of foreigners raised the incidents' profile. Coincidentally, Sydney Smith, a reporter from London's *Daily Express*, who was fortuitously on holiday in Srinagar, got himself to the frontline and bravely provided an 'eyewitness account of the lashkar's advance into Kashmir'. This 'scoop of the year' created professional envy among his journalist colleagues.⁵⁷ Conversely, the Pukhtoons' well-reported violence lost Pakistan much support among Kashmiris, who considered Karachi responsible for this invasion and their consequential hardships. This included a lack of electricity—for those with connections. On 24 October 1947, while advancing towards Srinagar, the Pukhtoons destroyed the region's only powerhouse at Mahura, east of Uri, which had been established in 1907. Soon after, a 'dark' Maharaja Hari Singh left Srinagar by car—his critics say he fled—for the safer location of Jammu town.

Apart from Pakistan's significant loss of support, there were two other important consequences of the Pukhtoons' invasion. First, on 26 October 1947, Maharaja Hari Singh finally made an accession—to India. Second, this gave India its legal basis to possess all of J&K, and to act accordingly thereafter as the sovereign power there. Some time after the Pukhtoons entered the Muzaffarabad District of Kashmir Province on 22 October 1947, Hari Singh sought help from India to defend his state and to repel the invaders. Based on a suggestion from Governor-General Mountbatten, New Delhi would only provide such support if the ruler of J&K acceded to India, which Hari Singh duly did. His accession was supposedly only in relation to the matters of foreign affairs, defence and communications. This satisfied New Delhi, which dispatched the Indian Army to Srinagar on 27 October 1947. There was some uncertainty about whether the Indian troops would be able to land in Srinagar and whether they would meet opposition. Their initial aims therefore were to secure Srinagar's airport, if possible, then to defend J&K's summer capital from the advancing Pukhtoons. They achieved both aims, including with some unexpected help in the former task from a small battery of gunners from Patiala who, surprisingly but advantageously, were stationed at Srinagar airport. The rapid arrival of Indian soldiers in Srinagar and their successful securing of the city ended the attempts by the slow-moving, plunder-distracted Pukhtoons to capture the summer capital and the Maharaja. India's decisive military action ultimately ensured that Pakistan was deprived of the Kashmir Valley.

With their initial aims achieved, India's military forces, with RIAF support, began to repulse all pro-Pakistan 'raiders' from J&K and to capture India's newly acquired state. To use the word 'recapture' would be incorrect as India had never—and has never—held all of J&K. This was a difficult task. Indian forces confronted some 10,000 'irregulars' comprising Pukhtoon tribesmen and 35,000–50,000 'men under arms, of varying military quality' in the pro-Pakistan 'Azad Army' militia that comprised men mainly from Azad Kashmir, but also from other parts of J&K.⁵⁸ Indian soldiers, supported by RIAF strafing and bombing, were able to expel their mainly Pukhtoon opponents from the Kashmir Valley, but not entirely from J&K. They were successfully opposed by men from the more disciplined Azad Army in Muzaffarabad Tehsil, west of Uri. Fighting on their home 'turf', soldiers in this militia were highly motivated, had considerable local knowledge, connections and support, and they enjoyed shorter supply lines. Many also had military experience obtained in the Indian Army during World War II or in the J&K State Forces. Their considerable fighting abilities and strengths, plus their rabid pro-Pakistan/anti-India attitudes, made some in New Delhi reluctant to advance beyond Uri and engage in what could well have become guerilla warfare. Although Indian forces had not secured all of J&K, Nehru was satisfied with the military situation as they had secured the bulk of J&K's Kashmiri-speaking population for India. Nehru felt more of an affinity with these people than with those to Uri's west, most of whom, but not all, were non-Kashmiris.

The Azad Army's capabilities made some Indians believe that the Pakistan Army was involved in J&K supporting this capable force. This was incorrect. As mentioned, some soldiers on leave from the Pakistan Army had returned home to help the pro-Pakistan cause and/or to defend their homes. Otherwise, the Pakistan Army officially only entered J&K in May 1948 to help the Azad Army, which by then was in grave danger of being overrun by India's military forces that had regrouped, were better armed and equipped, and which had the intimidating advantage of RIAF's air power. To its detriment, Pakistan only informed United Nations officials in UNCIP of this 'material change in the situation' in J&K around 7–9 July 1948. This was three weeks after the fact. Karachi's lack of disclosure further discredited Pakistan in the Kashmir dispute and boosted India's credibility.⁵⁹ Nevertheless, the official entry of the Pakistan Army into J&K began the first India-Pakistan war. While this prevented Azad Kashmir from being overrun, it also marked the start of the sidelining of

the people of J&K from direct involvement in resolving the Kashmir dispute.

A contentious accession

Apart from being long awaited, Maharaja Hari Singh's accession of 'his' Muslim-majority state to secular, Hindu-dominant India was contentious. For India, the accession meant that all of J&K now belonged to it. India immediately ordered Pakistan and its armed supporters to vacate India's territory. Jinnah's initial response was to order the Pakistan Army into J&K. However, the senior British officer, Field Marshall Auchinleck, would not allow Pakistan forces to enter what now legally comprised Indian territory. Auchinleck was then in overall command of both armies as the British Indian Army was still then being divided into the Indian Army and the Pakistan Army. On 30 October 1947, the Pakistan Government issued a statement stating that it did not accept the Maharaja's accession to India as it was 'based on fraud and violence'.⁶⁰ Senior Pakistanis, many of whom had once naively simply expected that J&K would join Pakistan, had come to believe that India had been deliberately conniving with Hari Singh to obtain J&K's accession. To try to prevent India's acquisition, some of these Pakistanis sent the Pukhtoons to capture J&K for Pakistan. When this tack failed, they claimed that India fraudulently would not, or could not, produce an actual signed Instrument of Accession. This was somewhat of a 'red herring' as Hari Singh's intentions and actions were clear following the Pukhtoons' invasion—he wanted J&K to join India. As for the violence, the Pakistanis stated that this involved the Maharaja's military attacking pro-Pakistan Muslims in Poonch, unsuspecting Muslims in eastern Jammu Province, and Muslim villages along the Pakistan border, all of which actions had provoked the Pukhtoon invaders. The Pakistanis were also displeased by India's imposition of the Indian Army on J&K.

Despite their protestations, what was clear was that Pakistanis disliked the fact that Indians had now legally 'won' J&K. Their Indian rivals had outmanoeuvred the Pakistanis by manipulating people and events in J&K to India's advantage, commencing even before the British withdrawal. For example: by ensuring the replacement of the Prime Minister of J&K, Ramchandra Kak, who considered that J&K should join Pakistan, with pro-India Prime Ministers; by possibly ensuring that Radcliffe awarded Gurdaspur to India; and, by visits to J&K by leading Congressmen, including Mahatma Gandhi, who met, and possibly influenced, Hari Singh in early August 1947. Pakistanis also had been engaging in 'dirty tricks' in J&K and had only themselves to blame for its 'loss', particularly as a result of the Pukhtoons' disastrous invasion, which many Indians—and, importantly, many Kashmiris—believed Karachi had instigated, and which had compelled Hari Singh to accede to India, not Pakistan. The Pukhtoon tribesmen, who were adept at looting and pillaging but inept at capturing territory, had failed to seize the most desired part of J&K, the Kashmir Valley, for Pakistan. Perhaps most importantly, Pakistanis were upset because, without having Pakistan's 'jugular vein' of Muslim-majority J&K, their nation was incomplete and might fail or die. Such weak and fallacious reasoning became a basis for Pakistan's ongoing irredentism: that J&K, for reasons of religion (Islam) and the supposed shared common culture, ethnicity, geography and/or history of Pakistanis and J&K-ites, should be with Pakistan. This discounts the circumstance often forgotten by Pakistanis that J&K-ites, such as Hindus, Buddhists, Sikhs, Gujjars, Shias, Sufi-inspired Muslims and Christians—as well as, indeed, many Sunnis—would not easily slot into Pakistan's feudal, tribal, Sunni-dominant and military-dominated polity. Conversely, Indian leaders have long claimed that there was/is a place for people of all religions in secular India.

Interestingly, had Pakistan obtained the Maharaja's accession in 1947 because of the Pukhtoons'

nefarious actions, New Delhi probably would have accused Karachi of obtaining the princely state by 'fraud and violence'. Such was the climate of rivalry and mutual dislike. The need of each nation to best the 'other' in every endeavour was, and still is, a compelling factor in India-Pakistan relations. It reflects their substantial shortage of trust and goodwill. Some Pakistanis consider that Hindus are 'devious'. More than once, senior Pakistanis have informed me that Indians, particularly Nehru, regularly consulted Kautilya's *Arthashastra*, a manual on statecraft, military strategy and matters of intrigue. Indeed, some have earnestly claimed that Nehru slept with a copy of this book under his pillow, as a result of which, presumably, the 'vibrations' and information from this manual surreptitiously seeped into his multifarious mind. The inference is that secular, modern Indians are influenced by, and act in accordance with the edicts of, this ancient Indian precursor to Machiavelli. While possibly so, the actions of some Indians *and* Pakistanis suggest that Kautilya, not surprisingly, has influenced people in both nations.⁶¹ Conversely, some very dismissive Indians have told me that they consider Pakistanis to be uncouth, dirty and devious. They find it hard to believe that Pakistan has survived for as long as it has. These examples of ignorance, prejudice and mistrust of the 'other' abound for a number of reasons, including the almost total absence of easy contact between the populations of India and Pakistan since 1947, and particularly since 1965. The shortage of trust and goodwill plays out as a dynamic in which neither side is prepared to 'give an inch' of 'territory' politically, militarily or diplomatically, to the 'enemy'. There is no such thing as a strategic or tactical withdrawal to lure an opponent into a trap or to obtain a longer term gain. It is an all or nothing, zero sum game in which 'your loss is my gain'.⁶² This 'trust deficit' is a serious shortcoming yet to be addressed, let alone overcome, in India-Pakistan relations.

Soon after the accession and probably because of it, Muslims in the Gilgit Agency followed the lead of Azad Kashmiris by also opposing Hari Singh's forces and opting for Pakistan. On 17 July 1947, the J&K Prime Minister had announced that the Maharaja's administration would take over the 'administration of the entire Gilgit territory' from the retiring British. On 1 August 1947, after receiving the Gilgit Agency and the Gilgit Leased Area back from the British, the Maharaja apparently deemed that these would become the unified 'Gilgit Frontier Province'.⁶³ Gilgitis, most of whom were Muslims and pro-Pakistan, disliked the departure of the British. Even worse, they disliked being ruled by a Hindu Dogra Governor. They also feared that, in Gilgit, the Maharaja would station Dogra troops, that he wanted to replace Muslims with Hindus in the administration, and that he would re-impose Dogra law. Those in the 'settled areas' of the Gilgit Leased Area remembered the unpopular pre-British period before 1935 when the Dogra regime had oppressed them, overtaxed them, imposed non-Sharia law, and compelled them to undertake *begaar*: unpaid royal service carrying loads up the notoriously bad 'Gilgit Road' from Srinagar to Gilgit town.

With the strong support of the local Gilgit Scouts, and possibly with the support of its British leadership and some visiting Pukhtoons, Gilgitis staged a largely bloodless uprising on or around 3 November 1947. They imprisoned the recently-arrived Governor, Brigadier Ghansara Singh, established a provisional government, made clear their desire to join Pakistan, then asked Karachi to send an administrator to the liberated area. Karachi did so later that month, after which its Political Agent, Sardar Muhammad Alam Khan, from NWFP, made—almost in a colonial way—the provisional government redundant. Given the large task that Alam confronted, he also used local rulers to administer their local areas. A second Pakistan official arrived in Skardu soon after to administer the area of Baltistan where people also had freed themselves from Hari Singh's rule. Thus, shortly after the Maharaja's accession to India, the Gilgit and Baltistan areas also became 'free' from (non-existent) Indian control.

The Gilgit uprising occurring soon after Hari Singh's accession was a significant event. It was an indigenous affair, although India believed that Pakistan had been involved, a claim Karachi dismissed. It showed that the Maharaja had been unable to re-establish his control since officially regaining this area on 1 August 1947. It confirmed that there was significant local disenchantment with Dogra rule. In this vein, the rulers of Hunza and Nagar, respectively Mir Muhammad Jamal Khan and Mir Shoukat Ali Khan, also 'acceded' to Pakistan in early November 1947; concurrently, the Governors of Yasin and Punial, respectively Raja Mir Mehboob Ali Khan and Raja Muhammad Anwar, acknowledged allegiance to Pakistan.⁶⁴ While significant indicators of their feelings and political aspirations for their areas, these local figures were not legally entitled to make such declarations as the Maharaja of J&K was their suzerain and only he could accede. Hence, Karachi chose only to acknowledge, not formally accept, these 'accessions' and 'acknowledgements of allegiance' in case such acceptance compromised Pakistan's overall aim of acquiring J&K in its entirety. (Conversely, New Delhi believed that Karachi had accepted these accessions and acclamations.) Thereafter, Pakistan directly administered this 'crucial portion of Kashmir' close to the USSR.⁶⁵ Karachi combined the Gilgit area with the 'liberated' areas of neighbouring Baltistan, after which this region was called the 'Northern Areas'. In 2009, it was renamed Gilgit-Baltistan. While this new name better reflects the region's two geographic components, it also suggests that J&K's northern frontier no longer has the strategic importance that it did under the British. Close China-Pakistan relations have totally negated any threat to northern J&K from China. The Russian/Soviet threat has totally disappeared following the demise of the USSR. An unstable, internally distracted Afghanistan has little direct ability to influence this region.

Soon after the Pukhtoons' invasion of J&K, New Delhi began to successfully employ a clever tactic to discredit local people opposing India in J&K. Indians began to use the term 'raiders' to incorrectly insinuate that *all* people fighting Indian forces in J&K were looters and plunderers from outside the state. This enabled New Delhi to seriously embarrass Pakistan, which, unable to defend itself from India's accusations of the Pukhtoons' unsavoury acts in J&K, acquiesced surprisingly quickly in India's ploy. This was possibly because India's tactic also enabled both nations to sideline the people of J&K from all discussions about 'their' state's status, chiefly because J&K-ites were falsely portrayed as not having played any major part in instigating the Kashmir dispute in 1947. Instead, New Delhi successfully propagated the idea that all violence in J&K began only when the Pukhtoon tribesmen invaded Kashmir Province on 22 October 1947—even though Indians palpably knew that J&K-ites themselves had actually instigated the Kashmir dispute. Non-J&K-ites, chiefly Pukhtoons, did play a part in 1947, but their chief and brief significance was to create mayhem and to compel the Maharaja's accession to India. These Pukhtoons clearly were outsiders and 'raiders'. Conversely, the large majority of India's other opponents in J&K in 1947 were from inside the state itself. These comprised men in the Azad Army, who mainly were from Jammu Province, and anti-India elements in Gilgit and Baltistan. All were indigenous State Subjects fully entitled to be in J&K. They successfully fought the Indian Army until 1949. In the context of this fighting in J&K, anyone not a State Subject had no right to be in the state, unless, post-accession, they were members of the Indian Army. The Pukhtoon raiders were outsiders who had no right to be in J&K. Those J&K-ites opposing Indian forces were 'insiders' who had every right to be in J&K. They were local people seeking to resolve J&K's international status, not outsiders wanting to loot and plunder. This made them rebels, not raiders.

As a result of the creation of Azad Kashmir, Hari Singh's accession to India and events in Gilgit, the area of contestation in J&K quickly became the Kashmir Valley. Many Muslims in this 93.5 per

cent Muslim-majority area possibly also did not accept Hari Singh's accession to India. However, if Kashmiris had wanted to challenge the accession in 1947, this would have been difficult to do. There was the deterring presence of large numbers of Indian military forces that arrived in their locality from 27 October 1947, and stayed. Additionally, Kashmiris, and their hastily established People's Militia of some 5,000 participants of whom only 1,000 were armed,⁶⁶ had to deal with the more pressing issue of the marauding Pukhtoons. Initially, many Kashmiris were therefore happy to have the Indian Army in the Kashmir Valley to help with this task. Thereafter, the Indian soldiers' presence became less popular. Of the other J&K-ites under India's control, Hindus and Sikhs in the Jammu region were happy with Hari Singh's accession to India, as were Buddhists in the remote Ladakh region. The opinion in 1947 of Shias in the Kargil area of Ladakh is not known, although as Baltis, which is what Buddhist Ladakhis call them, they may have had similar aspirations to their brethren around Skardu, who were anti-India. One thing is clear: after Hari Singh's accession to India, many Jammuites lost the power and prestige that they had enjoyed because they had been from the Maharaja's religion, region or Jamwal Rajput clan.

The 'People's Plebiscite'

In an early display of India's democratic credentials, Indian leaders, when accepting Maharaja Hari Singh's accession, talked of a 'reference to the people' to allow the people of J&K to decide whether they wanted the entire former princely state to join India or Pakistan. Both Governor-General Mountbatten and Prime Minister Nehru made this offer.⁶⁷ By early November 1947, leaders in India and Pakistan were specifically calling this 'reference to the people' a 'plebiscite': a direct vote in which all of the people of J&K would decide, by a majority, whether J&K, in its entirety, would join India or Pakistan. Resolutions passed by the United Nations Security Council later ratified a specific poll for J&K residents that I call the 'People's Plebiscite'. While people, governments and the UN talked about a democratic vote for the people of J&K to enable them to resolve their status, no one spoke of independence being offered as a third poll option. Although Hari Singh and Sheikh Abdullah had favoured this status for J&K, the post-accession stance of India and Pakistan, particularly post-Jinnah, was always clear, and it continues to be clear: neither J&K, nor any part of it, can become independent. Such India-Pakistan unanimity was, and is, exceedingly rare.

I use the term 'post-Jinnah' because, soon after the British withdrawal in 1947, Pakistan lost its two major leaders who had long dominated Pakistan's politics and policies, including on J&K. The first was Muhammad Ali Jinnah, who died of tuberculosis on 11 September 1948 and who might have accepted J&K becoming independent, as this at least would have deprived India of the princely state. The second was Liaquat Ali Khan, who was assassinated on 16 October 1951 at Rawalpindi, possibly as he wanted to improve acrimonial India-Pakistan relations and to resolve the Kashmir dispute. These deaths weakened Pakistan's young, unstable and struggling polity by removing some powerful and relatively secular leaders. Their demises also provided 'space' for the only well-organised and capable national entity, the Pakistan Army, to engage in politics.

Compared with Pakistan, India enjoyed considerable stability after 1947, with Jawaharlal Nehru serving as Prime Minister from 1947 until he died on 27 May 1964. The timing of Nehru's death was unfortunate, however. It cut short a visit by Sheikh Abdullah to Pakistan and Azad Kashmir that a distressed Nehru, almost as a final act, had allowed so that the Kashmiri could encourage Pakistan to enter genuine negotiations with India over J&K's international status. Sixteen months later, India and Pakistan were at war. After Nehru, Lal Bahadur Shastri served as Prime Minister until his untimely

death on 11 January 1966. Indira Gandhi, Nehru's only child, then ruled India from 1966 to 1977 and from 1980 to 1984, with the latter years of her first period marred by her imposition of an unpopular State of Emergency. This gave India 30 years of uninterrupted government by the Congress Party. Conversely, by the time that Mrs Gandhi lost office in March 1977, Pakistan had experienced two military coups, the loss of 'its' eastern wing, and a period of political stability under the popular, but volatile, Zulfikar Ali Bhutto that culminated in a third military coup led by General Zia-ul-Haq in July 1977. Unlike India, democracy was far from entrenched in Pakistan.

From late 1947, India sought (unsuccessfully) to have the United Nations Security Council condemn Pakistan's aggression in J&K based on Article 35 of the United Nations Charter. This article concerned, via its relationship with Article 34, a 'dispute or situation ... likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security'.⁶⁸ India's actual reference to the UNSC appeared on 1 January 1948. The UNSC began discussing 'The India-Pakistan question'—that is, Pakistan's dispute with India over J&K—from 6 January 1948. It continued to do so until 1965, after which the UNSC did not specifically look at this matter again. India's hopes of the UNSC chastising Pakistan failed. Instead, as Article 34 stated, the UNSC could 'investigate any dispute', which it decided to do in relation to J&K. In January 1948, the UNSC established the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan (UNCIP). Consequently, the UNSC's resolution of 21 April 1948 noted 'with satisfaction' that India and Pakistan both wanted the question of J&K's accession to be 'decided through the democratic method of a free and impartial plebiscite'.⁶⁹ This confirmed the requirement that a People's Plebiscite be held in J&K to resolve the Kashmir dispute.

After India involved the UN, India and Pakistan began their acerbic international legal, diplomatic and propaganda battle over J&K. This was fought worldwide over issues such as: the proposed plebiscite in J&K and which nation didn't want this to take place (India) or wasn't taking the right steps to allow it to take place (Pakistan); how to implement the various UN resolutions associated with J&K and which nation wasn't doing so (both); and some of the other instances of 'duplicity, double standards and diatribes' mentioned above over matters such as Junagadh, Hyderabad, and the use of force and subterfuge. Each nation's basic strategy was to shore up its position in the Kashmir dispute and show that it was right and correct, while the other nation was wrong and had erred. This constant contest meant that each negative point by the opponent needed to be refuted and each one of its own claims defended and reinforced. While this contest has ameliorated in more recent years, it has never ended.

It is a vexed question as to whether a People's Plebiscite would have resolved the Kashmir dispute.⁷⁰ Any poll would have confronted three very significant challenges. First, it would have needed all officials involved to participate with strict impartiality in order to ensure that a credible and acceptable process had occurred. Second, and more importantly, it required that all participating parties—India, Pakistan and the people of J&K—fully accept the 'winner-takes all' result. Third, it would have been difficult to ensure that the result, whatever it was, could be fully implemented without significant bloodshed and upheaval. There was great potential for protests and armed resistance by those dissatisfied with the result. Alternatively, people who had voted for the 'losing' nation could have sought to flee J&K for their preferred nation, thereby creating a major refugee problem in this nation. These were significant issues, given the precedent of Punjab's partition where Hindus and Sikhs refused to stay in Pakistan and fled to India, while Muslims went, or were 'encouraged', to move to Pakistan. The first challenge may have been surmountable, given that the United Nations was conducting the plebiscite. The second and third challenges would have been difficult to overcome, given the passion, divisiveness and vitriol surrounding India-Pakistan relations

and the Kashmir dispute.

On 1 January 1949, a UN-brokered ceasefire ended the fighting in J&K, and the first India-Pakistan war. Militarily, fighting had not brought about a conclusive result; politically, India had won. Indeed, by 1949, India had captured the 'moral high ground'. It had obtained the Maharaja's accession as a result of the Pukhtoons' brutal invasion. It had promised a People's Plebiscite so that J&K-ites could determine J&K's future. It had Pakistan trying to defend or deflect its support for the Pukhtoons and its blatant late disclosure of the Pakistan Army's official entry into J&K in 1948. Also, by 1949, India's military forces were, arguably, gaining the upper hand, particularly in the Ladakh and Gilgit areas. Indian forces had unexpectedly used armour (light tanks) at high altitude to defeat 500 Northern Scouts from the Gilgit and Baltistan areas who had marched south to try and capture the 11,000-foot high Zoji La on the strategic Srinagar-Kargil-Leh Road, of which some forty of 230 miles were then motorable. The Northern Scouts comprised members of the Gilgit Scouts and the newly-established Baltistan Scouts. They advanced towards Zoji La after finally capturing Skardu in September 1948 from a small body of besieged J&K State Forces. They also were threatening Ladakh. India believed, probably correctly, that the Pakistan Army was assisting the Scouts and planning their operations. After stopping their enemy at Zoji La, Indian forces moved further east, capturing Dras on 15 November and Kargil on 25 November 1948. This secured both Ladakh and the strategically important Srinagar-Kargil-Leh Road for India. In the south of J&K, the war situation was essentially a stalemate by 1949. At the entrance to the Kashmir Valley, neither side could advance beyond the strategically important town of Uri. Further south, pro-Pakistan forces could not capture the besieged Poonch City, while Indian forces could not dislodge the Poonchi or Mirpuri rebels from their strongholds located to the west of Poonch City along the traditional road to this city that ran from Mirpur, via Kotli. (The Indians later built a strategically important, all-weather road from Jammu town to Poonch City as a major re-supply route and to reduce the city's isolation and vulnerability.) When the Indian Army looked like it was making significant progress in J&K in mid-1948, the Pakistan Army entered the disputed state in May to assist the struggling pro-Pakistan forces. Its presence then largely nullified the Indian Army's previous advances, except in the remote Ladakh area.

The next major event post-ceasefire in the subcontinent was the Karachi Agreement in July 1949. As a result of it, Indian and Pakistani military representatives demarcated the ceasefire line in J&K. This line geographically, militarily and effectively divided the people of J&K and their state into Indian J&K and Pakistan-Administered J&K. Thereafter, these people had little official contact. India continued to claim all of J&K because of Maharaja Hari Singh's accession to it; Pakistan was administering 'its' portion of J&K until the UN plebiscite was held to resolve J&K's international status. In terms of India's actual control, Indian J&K comprised: Jammu, minus most of Poonch Jagir and Mirpur District; the Kashmir Valley, minus Muzaffarabad Tehsil; Ladakh, minus Skardu Tehsil. Pakistan-Administered J&K consisted of: Azad Kashmir, which was made up of most of Poonch Jagir, Mirpur District and Muzaffarabad Tehsil; the Northern Areas, which comprised the Gilgit Agency, Gilgit Leased Area and Skardu Tehsil. Apart from the Kashmir Valley, where people's aspirations were unable to be concretely quantified, there was a degree of certainty in 1949 that the majority of people in J&K's other four regions were happy being with their respective metropolitan power. From 1949, the division of J&K was maintained by the large and permanent presence of heavily-armed Indian and Pakistani military forces stationed along the ceasefire line that snaked through J&K. As a result of the Simla Agreement that India and Pakistan agreed in 1972 following their 1971 war, the ceasefire line was renamed the Line of Control. Some minor adjustments were

made to improve its viability, or ability to be defended, and it was delineated on nine maps that Indian and Pakistani military representatives agreed and signed.⁷¹ The LOC confirmed J&K's status as a divided entity that thereafter essentially only existed in some politicians' and some people's mind—an 'imagined' entity.⁷²

After the 1949 ceasefire and for the next few years thereafter, people in J&K were keenly expectant that the People's Plebiscite would be held 'soon' and that they would be voting to resolve J&K's disputed status. They believed that people would accept the poll's result, after which J&K would be reunified, delivered to India or Pakistan, and then, things would (miraculously) settle down and life would return to normal. Their expectation of the poll being held soon was despite the obvious acrimony and intransigence that had insidiously infused India-Pakistan relations since 1947. More practically, complete electoral rolls for J&K adults did not exist, nor was anyone directly striving to remedy this obvious shortcoming. There were more pressing problems elsewhere in the subcontinent for India and Pakistan to deal with. Nevertheless, UN Special Representatives sought to have the poll conducted. They failed.

There are a number of reasons why the People's Plebiscite has never been held. A major impediment was that Pakistan could not agree to the UN Security Council resolutions' requirement that it first withdraw its forces from J&K, then use its 'best endeavours' to secure the withdrawal of Pakistani nationals who did not normally reside in J&K, then allow India, which also was to withdraw the bulk of its forces from J&K, to move minimal forces into the vacated areas to maintain law and order while the UN conducted the plebiscite.⁷³ Due to its mistrust of India, Pakistan feared that the Indian forces would manipulate the poll in the vacated areas—and, indeed, in Indian J&K—to India's advantage. UNCIP had a concern that, should Indian forces enter the Gilgit area, where Gilgitis clearly had shown that they were pro-Pakistan in 1947, the Indians' 'presence would create considerable unrest among the local population and [might] cause guerilla fighting throughout Northern Kashmir'. Similarly, UNCIP was concerned about the 'disposition' of the '35,000' men still in the Azad Army, who also had fought strongly for J&K to join Pakistan in 1947–48, and about whether the Azad Kashmir Government should continue to operate.⁷⁴ Finally, Pakistan also feared that, once the Indian forces were in place in pro-Pakistan areas, they wouldn't leave, even if the poll went against J&K joining India.

Concurrently, Indian support for the plebiscite waned fairly quickly after 1947, chiefly as New Delhi perceived that India would 'lose' the poll if it were held. India clearly was unpopular in Azad Kashmir and the Northern Areas, although it was popular with Hindus and Sikhs in eastern Jammu and with Buddhists in Ladakh. The Kashmir Valley was the crucial area, and Indian popularity was under threat there as well. The negativity of the Pukhtoons' brutality in Baramulla had quickly waned. Concurrently, Kashmiris were becoming disenchanted with some heavy-handed Indian (mis)treatment. As early as July 1949, a member of India's Constituent Assembly told the Home Minister, Sardar Patel, that it was 'midsummer madness to believe that [India] can win the plebiscite' in J&K.⁷⁵ It is impossible to know exactly what levels of popularity India enjoyed in J&K, but certainly a perception existed that many J&K Muslims would vote for J&K to join Pakistan. The probable exception was Muslims in the Kashmir Valley where the secular Kashmiri leader, Sheikh Abdullah, had considerable popularity and sway. Even so, it was by no means certain that all Kashmiri Muslims were pro-India, although Indian and pro-India forces might have been able to 'influence' or intimidate them in India's favour. Given that the plebiscite has never been held, these are moot points.

PART FOUR

CONTEMPORARY, AND DIVIDED, J&K

J&K's five regions

Since the UN-brokered ceasefire came into effect on 1 January 1949, J&K has essentially comprised five, reasonably distinct regions. In alphabetical order, these are: Azad (Free) Jammu and Kashmir (or Azad Kashmir, for short); Jammu; Kashmir (the Kashmir Valley); Ladakh; and, the Northern Areas, now called Gilgit-Baltistan. Although India claims that all of J&K is an integral part of India, the Line of Control actually divides the former princely state of J&K into Indian-controlled J&K (Indian J&K) and Pakistan-Administered J&K. Politically and administratively, Indian J&K is a unified entity with a single legislature, comprising two houses, and three administrative divisions: Jammu, Kashmir, and Ladakh. Politically and administratively, Pakistan-Administered J&K comprises two separate entities: Azad Kashmir, and Gilgit-Baltistan. Pakistan administers these entities individually. [Table 2](#) provides details about the five regions of J&K.

Apart from population growth, there has been little change to the regional situation shown in [Table 2](#) since 1949. A lot has been written about the Indian 'side' of J&K, the structure and administration of which generally reflects how the rest of India operates. We know far less about the two regions in Pakistan-Administered J&K, both of which India considers to be occupied by Pakistan. Both regions also have unique arrangements with Pakistan not replicated in Indian J&K. This is partly because Pakistan is still only administering these two areas until the UN plebiscite resolves J&K's international status—and vicariously the international status of these two regions. Further information is provided below about J&K's five regions.

Table 2: Jammu and Kashmir after 1 January 1949, with Estimated Population in 2001 (Indian J&K) and 1998 (Pakistan-Administered J&K)

<i>Region</i>	<i>Area</i>	<i>Majority</i>	<i>Population (1941)</i>	<i>Population (2001)</i>
<i>Indian J&K</i>				
Jammu	10,073	Hindus	1,572,887	4,430,000
Kashmir Valley	5,838	Sunni Muslims	1,899,438	5,477,000
Ladakh	37,754	Buddhists/Shia Muslims*	88,651	237,000
<i>Pakistan-Administered J&K</i>			<i>1998</i>	
Azad Kashmir	4,494	Sunni Muslims	886,153	2,970,000
Northern Areas	25,302	Shia Muslims	253,763	1,200,000

- Sources: 1) *Census of India 1941*, Volume XXII, *Jammu & Kashmir State*, Part III, Village Tables, R.G. Wreford, Editor, Srinagar, Jammu and Kashmir Government, 1942;
- 2) *Census of Azad Kashmir, 1951*, Iftikhar Ahmad, Chief Enumeration Officer, Murree?, Government of Azad Kashmir, 1952.

- 3) *Census of India 1961, Volume VI, Jammu and Kashmir*, Part I-A (i), General Report, M.H. Kamili, Superintendent of Census Operations Jammu and Kashmir, Srinagar, Census of India, 1968.
- 4) *1998 Census Report of Azad Kashmir*, Islamabad, Population Census Organization, Statistics Division, Government of Pakistan, July 2001.
- 5) 'District Profile[s], Jammu & Kashmir', *Census of India*, New Delhi, (Indian) Ministry of Home Affairs, 2011, various pages, accessible at www.censusindia.gov.in/Tables_Published/Basic_Data_Sheet.aspx [accessed 22 September 2012].

Key: Area: In square miles

Pop. Population: Indian J&K, from 2001 Census; Pakistan-Administered J&K, from 1998 Census. (Most recent figures available.)

Figures rounded to nearest thousand.

* Both communities roughly equal in size.

Not shown in [Table 2](#) are details about the two areas that China controls and which India claims to be part of J&K: Aksai Chin, to the north-east of Ladakh; the Shaksgam Valley area in the eastern Trans-Karakoram Tract in Xinjiang that Pakistan ceded to China in 1963. Nevertheless, these two areas are included in the discussion below.

When the Maharaja of J&K acceded to India on 26 October 1947, J&K had effectively been divided politically and by fighting into pro-Pakistan and pro-India areas. By mid-November 1947, four different entities administered this divided state. In Azad Kashmir, local Muslims in the Muslim Conference, supported by the Azad Army, were in charge. In the Kashmir Valley, Sheikh Abdullah and his National Conference, supported by the Indian Army and the People's Militia, ran the Emergency Administration. In eastern and central parts of Jammu Province and the other parts of J&K, Hari Singh's administration, supported by his armed forces and police, ruled or attempted to rule. In Gilgit, a Pakistan administrator, supported by pro-Pakistan elements that included members of the Gilgit Scouts, governed. We now concentrate on Indian J&K, where the rapid demise of Maharaja Hari Singh's rule and influence meant that the Kashmir-based National Conference quickly became dominant.

Indian J&K

Post-accession, New Delhi successfully pressured Maharaja Hari Singh to have him include Sheikh Muhammad Abdullah in his administration—after he first released the Kashmiri from jail, of course. Concurrently, the ruler kept other political figures who weren't pro-India in jail. These included two of Abdullah's main rivals: the Muslim Conference leader, Chaudhri Ghulam Abbas, who was clearly popular in Jammu, mainly with Muslims, and the Kisan Mazdoor Conference leader, Prem Nath Bazaz, who was popular in Kashmir. Indeed, on 21 October, one day before the Pukhtoon's invasion, south Kashmir was reported as being the 'stronghold' of Bazaz, not Abdullah.¹ Abbas was freed in February 1948 and went to Pakistan, where, given his standing and connections, he quickly became the dominant figure in Azad Kashmiri politics. Concurrently, the pro-Pakistan Muslim Conference that he led completely disappeared as a serious rival to the National Conference in the Kashmir Valley. Bazaz was finally released in 1950, then externed from Indian J&K, to which he returned only in June

1962. Thus, Indian J&K was left almost exclusively to Abdullah and the National Conference, which party dominated politics thereafter in Indian J&K either in its own right or in a party derived from it. Indeed, the only times since 1947 that these Kashmiris have lost power was as a result of a single electoral defeat in 2002 or when New Delhi has imposed direct rule on Indian J&K. The sole election loss occurred when a coalition comprising a much newer Kashmiri party, the People's Democratic Party, and Congress, shared power from 2002–08. India has imposed direct rule, in the form of Governor's Rule or President's Rule, five times in Indian J&K: in 1977, for 3.5 months, after the ruling party lost its majority, but which also was an administrative device to allow Sheikh Abdullah and his party to be re-elected; in 1986, for ten months, after the ruling party lost its majority; in 1990, for six years and nine months, in relation to maintaining law and order during the Kashmiris' anti-India uprising; in 2002, for two weeks, due to inconclusive election results; and, in 2008–09, for six months, after the ruling coalition lost its majority. Similarly, all Prime or Chief Ministers of Indian J&K have been from Kashmir except one: Ghulam Nabi Azad, Chief Minister from November 2005 to July 2008. While Azad was from Doda, in Jammu, he nevertheless was of Kashmiri ethnicity, with his forebears apparently from Kulgam in Kashmir. The rule of these various Kashmiris has not always been benevolent.

From the outset, two important factors came into play in relation to Kashmiris: first, their attempts to retain the autonomy for J&K granted in 1947 and supposedly enshrined in the Indian Constitution; second, Indians' (usually unstated) suspicion of their loyalty to India.² Some Kashmiris, particularly Sheikh Abdullah, believed that the Maharaja's accession to India only gave New Delhi control of J&K's foreign affairs, defence and communications. In all other ways, the state was autonomous. The Indian Constitution's Article 370, which became operative in November 1952, seemingly confirmed this situation. Nevertheless, as we shall see, almost immediately after Article 370 was instituted, New Delhi began to steadily, and successfully, erode Indian J&K's 'special status' by ceaselessly integrating the state into the Indian nation. This autonomy issue has exasperated Kashmiris. It remains an issue, even though Indian J&K is, to all intents and purposes, now fully integrated into India administratively, economically and politically—although not emotionally.

Indians' suspicions of Kashmiris arose because many Muslim Kashmiris clearly favoured J&K joining (Muslim) Pakistan in 1947, rather than India. Indians' suspicions remain because many Kashmiris clearly are disgruntled with India, as their anti-India uprising since 1988 shows, with many either wanting their state to be independent of both India and Pakistan or wanting it to join Pakistan. Support for each of the three options of India, Pakistan or independence, is uncertain and unquantifiable. Given the choice, however, it seems that most Kashmiris would like independence. Such ingratitude confirms some Indians' suspicions of Kashmiris and makes them indignant, given how much 'treasure' that they perceive India has injected into Kashmir (and which money some Kashmiris, on occasions, have cleverly induced and used corruptly). Sheikh Abdullah, the most influential Kashmiri, also fed Indians' suspicions of Kashmiris by wavering between wanting independence for J&K or wanting it to be with India. Abdullah's equivocation began two days after the Maharaja's accession when the Kashmiri leader stated that 'the State might be well advised to accede to neither, but to retain neutral status and serve as a meeting ground for Hindu and Muslim ideas'.³ In late 1947, Abdullah further suggested, in front of an agreeing Hari Singh, that India and Pakistan should recognise J&K 'as an independent unit like Switzerland'.⁴ In November 1951, while addressing the Indian J&K Constituent Assembly, Abdullah asked its members to 'weigh' all three options—India, Pakistan, independence—and to 'pronounce where the true well-being of the country

lies'.⁵ (They chose India.) In 1953, Abdullah even spoke with India's Prime Minister about independence for J&K. For Nehru, he and Abdullah could discuss 'the quantum of autonomy ... but he could not imagine an independent Kashmir'. Indeed, Nehru would 'rather give Kashmir to Pakistan on a platter' than allow intrigues 'to dangle' J&K as a sword of Damocles over the two dominions.⁶ Independence for J&K was not an option.

Not surprisingly, therefore, since 1947, India's major concern in relation to the Kashmir Valley has been to ensure that this region's residents, many of whom probably don't want to be with India despite India's best efforts, actually do remain with this nation. To secure its position, India has regularly interfered in Kashmir, often excessively. This has included using local politicians to control, and sometimes repress, Kashmiris, with New Delhi always ensuring that a strongly pro-India politician has been in charge of Indian J&K. These men have helped India to retain control of the Kashmir Valley. So too has the Indian Army's considerable presence in J&K since 1947. This potent force has openly opposed any alteration of the status quo that would disadvantage India either in J&K or in those parts of J&K under Indian control. Its presence has also limited Kashmiris' ability to join Pakistan or to become independent. As Kashmiris witnessed during India-Pakistan wars in 1948, 1965 and 1971, the Indian Army, supported by the Indian Air Force, was able to defend Indian J&K, including Kashmir, against Pakistan's military forces. As Kashmiris have realised during their anti-uprising since 1988, the Indian Army, in support of various Indian paramilitary forces, has successfully opposed attempts by militant Kashmiris and others, covertly supported by Pakistan, to force India out of Kashmir. Despite the efforts of others, Kashmir is still with India.

A further factor to note in Indian J&K has been the slow and difficult process of instilling and installing genuine participatory democracy there. In 1947, all J&K-ites shared one similarity: no region inherited a strong democratic tradition. The Maharaja's autocratic behaviour and actions had informed all J&K-ites. Hari Singh had politically suppressed them, limited their free speech, jailed annoying local politicians, and tightly controlled elections to the essentially powerless J&K *Praja Sabha*. Similarly informed, post-Maharaja leaders who ruled J&K's various regions followed suit and engaged in similar practices. This made it difficult to establish robust, inclusive democracies that allowed freedom of speech and free and fair elections in J&K's regions. This also applied to Indian J&K, where the National Conference dominated. Its dominance was enabled when Nehru, post-accession, quickly ensured that Hari Singh's powers were curtailed and that the National Conference, whose base was in Kashmir, became pre-eminent in Indian J&K. This was not always popular with non-Kashmiris, nor was it to their wellbeing.

The process of Kashmir becoming pre-eminent in Indian J&K was assisted by Jammu's geographic and demographic diminution in the latter part of 1947. Jammu went from being the princely state's most populous and influential province to a clear second to the Kashmir Valley in the smaller political entity of Indian J&K that came into existence in late October 1947. This diminution occurred due to Jammu Province losing land in its west to Azad Kashmir and due to it losing people either to Azad Kashmir and Pakistan through emigration or through being killed. Population-wise, Jammu was partly compensated by its gain of Hindu and Sikh refugees from other parts of J&K and from western Punjab. However, this changed Jammu from a Muslim-majority region to a Hindu-majority one. Furthermore, after 1947, Kashmir became Indian J&K's most populous region, which also helped it to become politically supreme in India J&K. Additionally, Kashmiris, due to their region's longstanding prestige and the prestige of their leader, Sheikh Abdullah, along with his friendship with Jawaharlal Nehru, became the focus of attention within the larger Kashmir dispute and within Indian J&K itself.

Two other factors strengthened the Kashmiris' position. First, Azad Kashmir's lack of recognition as an alternative government for J&K kept the regional and international focus on the government located in Kashmir and on the Kashmiris who led it. Second, Kashmiri politicians manipulated elections to their advantage, which ensured that Kashmiris continued to dominate Indian J&K. Kashmiris did not actually need to manipulate polls in Indian J&K as they were already numerically superior there. This situation is irksome for Jammuites, who can never form a government in their own right in Indian J&K—even if the election held was genuinely free and fair. The Indian J&K Legislative Assembly was constructed so that Kashmiris always had more seats than Jammuites or Ladakhis combined. Until 1998, of the 75 seats in the Indian J&K Legislative Assembly, Kashmir had 42 seats, Jammu had 31 seats, and Ladakh had two. (Since 1998, the imbalance remains in place even though Jammu may now be more populous than Kashmir, with Kashmir now having 46 seats, Jammu 37 seats, and Ladakh four seats, in the 87-seat Indian J&K Legislative Assembly.) Unity among Jammuites also was difficult to achieve given Jammu's diverse population of Hindu castes and 'Harijans' (Untouchables/Dalits), who comprised 31 per cent of 'Hindus',⁷ and Muslims. By comparison, Kashmir ostensibly was both Muslim and homogenous.

Jammuites quickly reacted to their post-accession diminution to, and domination by, Kashmiris. A 'broad' consensus developed in Jammu that the Indian J&K Government had 'consistently discriminated against [Jammu] in favour of Kashmir'.⁸ Hindu Jammuites also feared that, should the People's Plebiscite be held, Muslim voters, who were in the majority, might deliver J&K to Pakistan, a distasteful prospect for Jammuites, especially after their (Hindu) ruler had clearly acceded to (non-Muslim-majority) India. By March 1949, a Jammu party, the Praja Parishad, was calling for regional plebiscites for J&K's five regions. This would allow Jammuites (only) to determine the fate of their own region. The Praja Parishad also disliked the National Conference's 'radical reforms' that ended hereditary rule and abolished landlordism without compensation.⁹ Both matters impacted on Jammuites most of all, chiefly as many of them, particularly Hindus, had associated closely with the Dogras' regime. As the likelihood of a plebiscite receded, Jammu politicians sought Indian J&K's full integration into India. This reflected both their dislike for Article 370 and their strong political aspiration for J&K to be part of India. Equally, they wanted to dilute Kashmiris' dominance of Indian J&K—and of them. Jammu politicians also sought other options for Jammu, including its full autonomy within Indian J&K, for Jammu to join another Indian state, or for it to become a separate state itself. In 1953, an agitation in Jammu to end Indian J&K's special autonomy and integrate the state fully into India peaked when the President of the (Indian) Jana Sangh, Shyama Prasad Mukherjee, died in June while in custody in a Srinagar jail. Mukherjee disliked the 'three nation theory' that comprised, as he saw it, India, Pakistan and J&K, with J&K's special status guaranteed by Article 370 of the Indian Constitution. This made Indian J&K unacceptably different from all other Indian states. Mukherjee's death in June 1953, and an anti-Abdul-lah wave in Jammu thereafter, possibly provoked Nehru to agree to allow Karan Singh to dismiss Abdullah in August 1953, by which time the Kashmiri had become ambivalent at best about India. Concurrently, Jammu politicians were placated with the promise of more autonomy.

In the eastern region of Indian J&K known as Ladakh, some Ladakhis indicated as early as 1949 that they did not want to endure Kashmiris' domination. The President of the Ladakh Buddhist Association wrote to Nehru asking for Hari Singh's rule to be continued or for permission for Ladakh to join East Punjab as this was 'the only guarantee for our future progress and development'. Liking what the Dogra regime had done for them since 1834, the Ladakhis, who obviously had long memories, 'desired to see nothing more of the administrators from Kashmir, who had mostly

governed us during the past to our utter ruin'.¹⁰ Post-Maharaja, however, Ladakhis suffered from three drawbacks: their sparse population; their almost total inability to have meaningful contact with the Indian mainland; and, their remoteness from Indian J&K's political centres of Srinagar or Jammu City. The region of Ladakh comprises two lightly-populated districts: Buddhist-dominant Ladakh and Shia-dominant Kargil. Before 1947, both areas enjoyed contacts with the Gilgit and Baltistan areas of J&K that later came under Pakistan's administration. Since 1947, however, Ladakh has been almost totally economically and politically dependent on the Kashmir Valley. It also has only been entitled to two seats in the Indian J&K Legislative Assembly. This gives Ladakhis very little power or control over their own destiny, or the destiny of Indian J&K. Indeed, increasingly disenchanted with their lack of autonomy, the Ladakh Buddhist Association began a movement in 1988 to secure 'a better deal' for Ladakhis. In 1995 and 2003, autonomous, municipal-type Hill Councils were established respectively for Ladakh and Kargil. These have eased, but not necessarily ended, some religious and ethnic tension in the region, with Buddhists in the remote and rugged Zaskar area wanting more autonomy within the Shia-dominant Kargil Hill Council. Population growth is another issue, with the Shia population allegedly growing faster than Buddhist numbers. The establishment of these Hill Councils has not necessarily placated people's desire for a separate territory or state of Ladakh in order to lessen their dominance by Kashmiris.

A very important factor in enabling Kashmiris to dominate Indian J&K and its politics was Jawaharlal Nehru. Indeed, his role was pivotal until he died in 1964. Primarily, Nehru was responsible in 1947 for having Sheikh Abdullah freed from jail, then for enabling Abdullah and the National Conference to secure, consolidate and retain significant power in Indian J&K thereafter, and to often wield this power undemocratically. Apart from his friendship with Abdullah, Nehru believed that the Kashmiri and his colleagues were the most popular politicians in J&K, that they reflected the opinion of the majority in J&K, and that only they could deliver stability to the state. The mutual dislike of Nehru and Abdullah for Maharaja Hari Singh and for Pakistan had given them similar agendas, albeit fairly short-term: to rid J&K of the autocratic ruler and to ensure that J&K did not join Pakistan. Their close relationship partly explains why Muslim-majority J&K—or a large part of it—joined secular, Hindu-dominant India and not Muslim Pakistan. Equally, Nehru's great infatuation for Kashmir and his blind desire to keep this region with India meant that he often excused Kashmiri excesses, chiefly because they were committed by men who were anti-Pakistan and/ or pro-India. Nehru really only began to limit Kashmiris' power and to impose India's will in Indian J&K in 1952, chiefly via the Delhi Agreement made between representatives of the Indian J&K Government and the Indian Government. It stated that Indian J&K was part of the Indian Union, but with certain unique privileges, including in relation to retaining and exercising residuary powers (which powers resided with New Delhi for most other Indian states). Equally, the agreement started the process of imposing the Indian President, the Indian Supreme Court and some Emergency powers on Indian J&K. In effect, these started to tie Indian J&K closer to India and to dilute Article 370 of the Indian Constitution.

Reverting to 1953, a major change occurred in Indian J&K when Karan Singh, serving as Sadar-e-Riyasat (Chief of State), dismissed the locally popular Sheikh Abdullah because the Kashmiri openly suggested that J&K should be independent. Almost certainly, Singh did this with Nehru's approval, if not at the Indian's behest. Abdullah's sacking was a turning point in relations between India and Indian J&K. For most of the next twenty years, the locally popular Abdullah's ability to directly influence J&K politics was minimised by long spells in detention, under house arrest or because he was exiled from the state. After being sacked as Prime Minister, Abdullah was not given an opportunity to prove his popularity either in the Indian J&K Legislative Assembly or within Indian

J&K. The administration under Ghulam Mohammad Bakshi, who replaced him as Prime Minister of Indian J&K, kept him in jail or under house arrest, without trial, for two periods: August 1953–January 1958 and April 1958–April 1964. After Abdullah's sacking, the Bakshi administration also detained another six members of the Indian J&K Legislative Assembly until October 1956. From May 1965 until January 1968, the Indian Government also detained Abdullah. Hence, in almost fifteen years, the Kashmiri was detained for over thirteen years. This wasn't the end: the Indian J&K Government under G.M. Sadiq exiled Abdullah from Indian J&K and outlawed the National Conference while it 'conducted' the 1971 elections. By contrast, Maharaja Hari Singh had been relatively benign. Between 1931–1947, he only jailed Sheikh Abdullah for a total of six periods and thirty-three months.¹¹ The final term in 1946–47 was Abdullah's longest in one of the Maharaja's jails, lasting for one year, four months and ten days.

Concurrent with Abdullah being marginalised, New Delhi asserted its will in Indian J&K, including by ensuring that it determined which Kashmiri would rule there. Four local surrogates who served as Prime or Chief Ministers helped to tie Indian J&K to India: Bakshi Ghulam Mohammad (served 1953–63), Khwaja Shamsuddin (1963–64), G.M. Sadiq (1964–71), and Mir Qasim (1971–75). Starting with Bakshi, Indian J&K moved closer to India via legislation passed in one or both of their legislatures. In February 1954, the Indian J&K Constituent Assembly unanimously reaffirmed Indian J&K's accession to India and requested closer formal links with it.¹² In May 1954, the Indian President's jurisdiction was imposed over Indian J&K, India's powers in relation to the state were enlarged, and most provisions of the Indian Constitution were applied to Indian J&K.¹³ In 1957, the new Indian J&K Constitution stated unequivocally in its Preamble that the state was an integral part of the Union of India. In May 1958, a Presidential Order extended the jurisdiction of the Indian Comptroller and Auditor General over Indian J&K. In August 1958, Indian legislation extended the Indian Administrative Service and the Indian Police Service to Indian J&K.¹⁴ In 1959, the Indian J&K Legislative amended the Constitution to extend the jurisdiction of the Indian Electoral Commission and the Supreme Court of India to Indian J&K. In 1960, a Presidential Order incorporated these changes into the Indian Constitution. In 1959, the permit system that had put restrictions on non-permanent residents was abolished.¹⁵ In 1961–62, the Indian J&K Legislative Assembly enabled non-state subjects 'who intend to set up industries' to purchase land and other immovable property in Indian J&K. This ended the ban on the investment of outside capital in Indian J&K.¹⁶ From 1954 until 1974, a further 138 central acts were made applicable to Indian J&K. Between 1956 and 1977, twenty-eight Presidential amendments were applied to the state.¹⁷ Ostensibly, despite Article 370, Indian J&K had been integrated into India.

In terms of elections, until about 1970, people in Indian J&K had more exposure to these democratic practices, albeit often sham, than people in Azad Kashmir or the Northern Areas, both of which regions Pakistan directly or indirectly dominated. From 1951 to 1989, Indian J&K conducted eight supposed multi-party, adult suffrage elections: in 1951, 1957, 1962, 1967, 1972, 1977, 1983, 1987. While this suggested that genuine democracy had become entrenched in Indian J&K, only one election (1977) or perhaps two (1977 and 1983) had been truly free and fair. All others had been rigged. This involved practices such as: rejecting, or simply not accepting, candidates' nominations; kidnapping, exiling or detaining candidates to prevent them from nominating or campaigning; creating pre-election environments of terror and intimidation to ensure that people either didn't vote or that they felt compelled to vote for the ruling party; engaging in malpractices with the distribution of ballot papers and/ or the counting of votes, including ballot stuffing and not allowing scrutineers to inspect

ballot papers; the biased use of government machinery to support the ruling party's candidates; and, control, manipulation or intimidation of the press. All elections conducted in Indian J&K between 1951 and 1983 were won by the National Conference (1951, 1957, 1962, 1977, 1983) or by a derivative of this party comprising either the state branch of the Indian National Congress (1967; 1972). This 'derivative' were heavily dominated by pro-India members of the former National Conference who, post-Nehru, patriotically and assiduously had merged their party into Congress on 3 January 1965. The Kashmiris adhered to this arrangement under both Shastri and the assertive Indira Gandhi. In 1975, however, the state branch of Congress did a 'reverse merge' (or separation) from the National Conference, which latter party the revitalised Sheikh Abdullah had reconstituted. An aberration occurred in June 1984 when Mrs Gandhi's machinations ensured that her 'man', Ghulam Mohammad Shah, and his Awami National Conference, replaced the dismissed Farooq Abdullah and his National Conference administration. Shah's regime lasted until March 1986, when Governor's Rule replaced it. Partly, Shah's empowerment involved Mrs Gandhi imposing her phenomenal, manipulative, political will on Indian J&K. It also amounted to a family tussle as Shah's party had evolved from the National Conference, while Shah himself was Farooq Abdullah's brother-in-law.

Under G.M. Sadiq, the Prime or Chief Minister of Indian J&K from 1964–71 and its most actively pro-India leader, the process of 'coercive homogenisation and assimilation' of Indian J&K into the Indian Union 'reached its peak'.¹⁸ During 1964–65, Articles 356, 357 and 249 of the Indian Constitution were made applicable to Indian J&K. These respectively, and importantly, allowed the central government to dismiss an elected state government, to assume its legislative functions, and to legislate on subjects reserved exclusively for Indian states. In 1965, Sadiq changed various local nomenclature to reflect those used throughout India. Thus, 'Sadar-i-Riyasat' became 'Governor', while the 'Prime Minister' became the 'Chief Minister', a change that impacted personally on Sadiq. Additionally, New Delhi was empowered to appoint the Governor, not the Indian J&K Legislative Assembly, as had been the case. A further change occurred in 1967 when electors in Indian J&K became directly involved in the Indian political system by electing six representatives to India's Lok Sabha (People's House; lower house): three from Kashmir, two from Jammu; one from Ladakh. Previously, the Indian J&K Legislative Assembly had nominated these representatives.

In 1975, when Sheikh Abdullah returned as Chief Minister, he temporarily ended further actions to bind Indian J&K to India. By then, however, Indira Gandhi had been the effective power in both India and Indian J&K since the mid-to-late 1960s. India's convincing victory in the 1971 India-Pakistan war had further strengthened her position, making her politically unassailable for a time. Concurrently, people on both sides of the LOC came to realise that India had a substantial, and superior, military capability to defend Indian J&K than Pakistan's. Similarly, they realised that Pakistan, despite its desires, was unable to 'liberate' this Muslim-majority entity. One such J&K-ite was Sheikh Abdullah. In November 1974, he concluded the 'Kashmir Accord' with Mrs Gandhi that (supposedly) finally resolved the accession issue by stating that J&K was 'a constituent unit of the Union of India' and which dealt with the constitutional aspects of the India-Indian J&K relationship.¹⁹ In many ways, this accord was similar to the 1952 Delhi Agreement. By agreeing to it, Abdullah was able to regain the position taken from him in 1953, albeit with a different name: Chief Minister, not Prime Minister. He did so in February 1975. In return, he essentially 'legitimized' all political and constitutional actions undertaken in, by, or for, Indian J&K between 1953 and 1975. Thereafter, Kashmiris experienced political stability for the next seven years.

In September 1982, the monumental Kashmiri figure, Sheikh Abdullah, died. Thereafter, Indian J&K slowly slid into turmoil. In 1984, the scheming Mrs Gandhi replaced Farooq Abdullah, the

politically inexperienced son and successor of Sheikh Abdullah, as Chief Minister with his ambitious, but politically weak, brother-in-law, Ghulam Mohammad Shah. The divisive Shah was unpopular locally. So too was the eight months of President's Rule in 1986 that was instituted after Shah and his ineffective government lost their majority. In November 1986, which was shortly before elections due in March 1987, Farooq Abdullah was ominously appointed Chief Minister again. Thereafter, things got considerably worse. Surprisingly, Farooq, whose father, Sheikh Abdullah, and himself had been badly treated by the Nehru-Gandhi family, electorally aligned with India's Prime Minister, the politically inexperienced Rajiv Gandhi, who had reluctantly assumed leadership of India and the Congress Party following his mother's assassination by her Sikh bodyguards in October 1984. 'Overnight, Farooq was transformed from hero to traitor in the Kashmiri mind.'²⁰ Furthermore, although there was little chance that the National Conference-Congress alliance would lose the elections, Farooq and/or Gandhi decided to ensure the victory of their alliance by having the 1987 elections rigged in their favour. Unwisely, they also sought to excessively limit the electoral success of others, particularly the new, and popular, Muslim United Front. Competing as independents, Muslim United Front candidates won only five seats instead of the expected ten plus. This result was surprising as independents had obtained a massive 34.8 per cent of the 1987 vote. This, however, only translated into independents winning eight seats.

Most analysts consider that the 1987 elections in Indian J&K were neither free nor fair. Most importantly, many Kashmiris also considered these elections to have been severely manipulated—that is, rigged. Coupled with the dilution of Indian J&K's supposed autonomy under Article 370 and high unemployment among well-educated Kashmiri youth, this 'denial of democracy' and the associated brutal repression of Kashmiris unwilling to accept the rigged polls, were the final straw.²¹ Disenfranchised, disenchanted, dissenting Kashmiri youth took up arms in an attempt to liberate Kashmir from Indian control. Many wanted independence for Kashmir; others wanted it to join Pakistan. When Kashmir's law and order situation deteriorated dramatically and seriously, New Delhi suspended Indian J&K's democracy in January 1990. Direct Governor's Rule under Governor Jagmohan Malhotra was then imposed on Indian J&K, which also affected insurgency-free Jammu and Ladakh. While this imposition was attributed to India's need to deal with the anti-India uprising, Jagmohan's harsh, unpopular and supposedly remedial rule repressed all Kashmiris equally, except for those he was aiming to control—the extra-legal, anti-India militants. President's Rule replaced Governor's Rule in July 1990 when the situation further deteriorated. This continued until October 1996. While Kashmir's political deterioration was somewhat unexpected, even more surprising was the Kashmiris' entire anti-India uprising. They had long been considered gentle people and a 'non-martial race'.

From 1988, the Kashmir Valley experienced high levels of political protests and militant activity in what quickly became a fully-fledged anti-India uprising.²² In 1989, this uprising turned violent. Over time, large numbers of Indian paramilitary forces—possibly as many as 300,000, according to Pakistan—defeated the militants and restored normalcy to the Kashmir Valley. In the early years of the struggle, the militants and their actions received strong support and sympathy from Muslim Kashmiris. Few, if any, Hindu Pandits supported the uprising. Indeed, from 1990, most Kashmiri Pandits—possibly as many 250,000 people—feeling threatened by anti-India Islamic extremists, fled Kashmir for Jammu or Delhi, where many now live as refugees. While the Muslim militants may not have directly threatened Hindu Pandits, many of the latter perceived that their lives were unsafe, or were under threat, in Kashmir. The Pandits' migration marked a major demographic, social and cultural change to Kashmir. It also weakened Kashmiris' long held concept of Kashmiriyat, or

inclusiveness. Many Kashmiri Muslims would like the Pandits to come back to Kashmir: they feel that Kashmir is incomplete without its Hindu minority. While some Pandits have returned, many others are fearful of returning to Muslim-dominant Kashmir. Many also have made new lives for themselves elsewhere and wish to remain there. Some Pandits in the 'Panun Kashmir' ('Our Kashmir') movement will only return to the Kashmir Valley if Pandits are granted a separate homeland there. This apparently would help them to feel more secure. Given that Kashmiri Pandits were previously dispersed throughout Kashmiri society, the provision of a separate homeland for them is unlikely to happen. To create such an area would require depopulating it of Kashmiri Muslims, which action itself would be politically unpopular, logistically difficult and likely to create a disgruntled element that would be hard to placate.

Despite deploying 300,000 paramilitary, the Muslim Kashmiris' anti-India uprising caused India major problems. Equally, Kashmiris themselves were disunified and they lost control of 'their' uprising. In 1993, twenty-six groups in Kashmir formed the All Parties Hurriyat (Freedom) Conference in an attempt to present a unified front. While still functioning, the Hurriyat has divided into pro-Pakistan and pro-independence elements. Those fighting the anti-India uprising also received significant moral, political, diplomatic and physical support from Azad Kashmiris and Pakistanis, although the Pakistan Government always denied providing anything but diplomatic and moral support to the anti-India militants who, after the 11 September 2001 ('9/11') attacks in the United States, were rebranded by India as 'terrorists'. Conversely, the uprising received no support from (pro-India) Jammuites and Ladakhis, who were not directly involved in it, nor were they sympathetic to it. From the mid-1990s, Kashmiris lost control of their militancy to 'foreign'—that is, non-Kashmiri—militants who were much better armed and supported by Pakistan. Concurrently, Islamabad chose not to support Kashmiri insurgents who wanted independence for Kashmir to anywhere near the same extent. The Kashmir uprising has resulted in at least 50,000 deaths and significant political, economic, social, emotional and psychological upheaval and hardships among Kashmiris. Many are now reluctant or compelled citizens of India, although the preferred option of many Kashmiris seemingly is independence from both this nation and Pakistan.

By around 1999–2000, 'war weariness' had set in amongst Kashmiris. By this time, a fair degree of normalcy also had returned to Kashmir. Elections had been conducted again in 1996. As this was during the height of the insurgency, some groups boycotted the elections, the number of candidates was down, and voter turnout varied from 10 per cent in Kashmir, where Indian security forces 'assisted' or compelled Kashmiris to vote, to 60 per cent in Jammu. The National Conference won a two-thirds majority, as well as seats in all three of Indian J&K's regions, which was a first. Genuine participatory democracy returned to Indian J&K in 2002, with reasonably free and fair elections held that year, and again in 2008. In 2002, voter turnout was 44 per cent. A coalition of the (Kashmiri) People's Democratic Party and the Indian National Congress, supported by independents, formed the government. This was the first time that the National Conference, or a derivative thereof, had not held power in Indian J&K. The results also suggested that the elections had not been manipulated. Thereafter, Indian J&K had two Chief Ministers who served for three years each: Mufti Mohammad Sayeed, from the People's Democratic Party, and Ghulam Nabi Azad, from Congress. In 2008, the National Conference again won power, although this time in coalition with the Congress Party. Voter turnout was 61 per cent, despite bitterly cold weather. The new Chief Minister, Omar Abdullah, was the grandson of Sheikh Abdullah, the son of Farooq Abdullah, and the youngest ever person to hold this position. The next elections in Indian J&K are due in late 2014. The successful 2008 elections didn't mean that Kashmiris were no longer disgruntled. On the contrary, serious stone throwing

incidents in mid-2010 in major Kashmiri centres showed that Kashmiris, particularly young Kashmiris, were disenchanted. For the first time, these Kashmiris used social media to organise their often impromptu anti-India demonstrations. One major method was the rapid use of SMSs to gather and disburse crowds. Perhaps what the 2008 elections showed was that Kashmiris wanted a say in how they were governed.

Indian J&K is now one of the twenty-nine states and seven territories in the Indian Union. Apart from differing from most other Indian states because of Article 370 of the Indian Constitution, the state differs from other Indian states in one other way: it has two capitals. Continuing the Dogra rulers' practice begun in 1872 to 'escape ... extreme weather conditions' in the Kashmir Valley during winter and in the Jammu region during summer, Jammu City is the winter capital of Indian J&K and Srinagar is the summer capital. The *darbar*, or administration, moves between these each year. In 2010, it cost 'an estimated Rs 20 crore' to move 'nearly 10,000 employees from Srinagar to Jammu at the onset of winter and back to Srinagar ahead of summer'. Each employee received Rs 6,000 (approximately USD 133) as a travel allowance.²³ While this annual movement of politicians and the administration is neither efficient nor necessarily popular with voters in Indian J&K, vested interests in Srinagar or Jammu oppose making the other city the permanent, year-round capital. No politician has yet had the political will to resolve the vexatious issue of which city should be J&K's capital. Logistically, Jammu City might be the better option as it is located closer to the Indian mainland. Equally, Srinagar is Indian J&K's most populous and most prestigious city. Perhaps a third, or new, option is needed?

Indian J&K has a bicameral system of government comprising an elected 87-member *Vidhan Sabha* or Legislative Assembly (lower house) and a 36-member *Vidhan Parishad* or Legislative Council (upper house).²⁴ Members of the Legislative Assembly are popularly elected by direct elections and serve for six years, unless the Assembly is dissolved beforehand. (The Governor can nominate two additional women members.) These members elect the majority (twenty-one) of the Legislative Council's thirty-six members; the state Governor appoints six members; local councils elect seven members; two are representatives from professionals. Legislative Council members have a fixed six-year term, with dissolution beforehand not possible. All power in Indian J&K resides with the Legislative Assembly. The Legislative Council only has restricted powers of review and no ability to modify or reject financial bills. Invariably, therefore, ministers come from the Legislative Assembly. Voters in Indian J&K also elect six representatives to India's *Lok Sabha* (People's House; lower house): three from Kashmir; two from Jammu; one from Ladakh. The Legislative Assembly elects four representatives to India's *Rajya Sabha* (Council of States; upper house). The President of India appoints the Governor of Indian J&K. The Indian Administrative Service, Indian Police Service and Indian Forest Service provide senior staff to the Indian J&K administration.

Jammuites, with much justification, complain that Kashmiris receive too much attention and too many resources, usually to their (and to Ladakhis') detriment. Indeed, despite Jammu being larger in area and contributing 70 per cent of the state's revenue, it receives only 30 per cent of development allocations in what, in any case, is a deficit state reliant on grants (30 per cent) and loans (70 per cent) from India in order to function economically. Jammuites also are heavily under-represented in the state's 87-seat Legislative Assembly: Kashmir has forty-six electorates; Jammu has thirty-seven; Ladakh has four. A subset of this situation involves calls by (mostly nomadic) Gujjars, Pahari speakers and Dogras in Jammu for special benefits to advance their perceived or actual 'backward' status. Some pro-India Jammuites and Ladakhis still seek separate state or territory status for their respective region and/ or for J&K's complete integration into India. They do not want any special

considerations or benefits to be given specifically to Kashmiris. Apart from reflecting their disenchantment with domination by Kashmiris, the situation of Jammu Hindus and Ladakhi Buddhists reflects the subcontinental saying that also applies to J&K: ‘every community is a minority’. Hence, while Muslim Kashmiris may dominate Indian J&K, Muslims are a minority in India; while Hindus are a majority in India, they are a minority in Indian J&K; while Muslims are a majority in Pakistan; they are minority in the subcontinent. And so on. The great challenge for every South Asian government is ‘... to win the trust of its minorities’.²⁵ This also applies to J&K.

Pakistan-Administered J&K

Pakistan-Administered J&K comprises two regions that are politically separate: Azad (Free) Jammu and Kashmir, which is popularly called ‘Azad Kashmir’, and Gilgit-Baltistan, which was called the ‘Northern Areas’ until 2009. Although geographically contiguous, the two areas are separated by rugged terrain and they have few, if any, direct transport or communication links. This has resulted in little direct social, cultural or economic interactions. Instead, indirect connections have usually been outside J&K in cities like Rawalpindi or Lahore, where J&K-ites have traditionally gone to obtain work during colder months. In 1947, the strongly majority-Muslim populations in these two areas clearly favoured J&K joining Pakistan—and fought for this to occur. Consequently, both regions have always been ‘free’ from Indian control. For its part, Pakistan has ensured that these regions have been kept politically separated from each other. Possibly, this was to keep greater control over the large, strategically important Northern Areas that abutted China and Afghanistan. It may also have been for pragmatic geographic and administrative reasons: the Northern Areas was only really accessible from NWFP and not from Azad Kashmir, while the Azad Kashmir administration in 1947 was rudimentary and barely able to administer its own area, without adding the burden of the significantly larger Northern Areas. Finally, keeping the two regions separate represented the political and military realities in 1947: the Azad Kashmir movement and the pro-Pakistan forces in Gilgit had never been unified. And, while these regions both wanted to join Pakistan, they did not necessarily want to join each other.

Karachi formalised the separation of Azad Kashmir and the Northern Areas via a ‘Heads of Agreement’ that Pakistan officials signed with Azad Kashmir’s better organised, better connected and higher profile leaders in April 1949.²⁶ Azad Kashmiris had these advantages partly because they were able to access Pakistani cities, such as Rawalpindi and Lahore, more easily than people from the remoter Northern Areas. Thereafter, Azad Kashmir came under the overbearing control of Pakistan’s Ministry of Kashmir Affairs (MKA), while a Pakistani official administered the Northern Areas, ostensibly as an autocratic bureaucrat with few checks on his officialdom. The separation of Azad Kashmir and the Northern Areas was important as the Azad Kashmiris had previously claimed that the Azad Kashmir Government was the legitimate government for all of J&K. (Consequently, over time, Azad Kashmir developed an excessively-large bureaucracy in case this proposition ever became a reality.) However, this separation weakened the Azad Kashmiris’ position in relation to the J&K freedom movement. Had Azad Kashmir been larger, it may have been more powerful and influential—and a genuine opponent to its rival in power in Indian J&K. In reality, it was never recognised as such. As a result, the international focus in the Kashmir dispute invariably has been on Indian J&K, and particularly on its Kashmir part, rather than on Azad Kashmir.

Hence, since 1947, Azad Kashmir and the Northern Areas have existed as separate entities, albeit under Pakistan’s control and tutelage. In 1993, two people from the Northern Areas and one Azad

Kashmiri successfully challenged the 1949 ‘Heads of Agreement’ in the Azad Kashmir High Court, stating that the Northern Areas should be annexed to Azad Kashmir and administered by the Azad Kashmir Government. In 1994, the (superior) Azad Kashmir Supreme Court overruled this verdict, essentially on a technicality, stating that the Azad Kashmir High Court did not have the ‘necessary jurisdiction’ to order Pakistan to cede control of the Northern Areas to the Azad Kashmir Government. This did not necessarily mean that the Azad Kashmir Government should not govern all of Pakistan-Administered J&K. Rather, the Azad Kashmir Government lacked the wherewithal to compel Pakistan to enable Azad Kashmiris to do so. Some Shias in the Northern Areas, in which group are included Ismailis, were thankful for this altered decision as they had feared being dominated by Sunnis if the two regions had been merged.

Despite their close political, religious and social connections with Pakistan and their full integration into the Pakistan economy, both Azad Kashmir and the Northern Areas/Gilgit-Baltistan are not legally part of Pakistan. Since 1947, Karachi/Rawalpindi/Islamabad has only been administering these regions until the United Nations plebiscite resolves J&K’s, and vicariously these regions’, international status. Starting from General Zia’s rule of Pakistan from 1977–88, however, Pakistan increasingly has tried to suggest, including cartographically, that the Northern Areas/Gilgit-Baltistan is not part of the Kashmir dispute. India appears, at times, to have unwittingly acquiesced in Pakistan’s stance. Pakistan’s control of this region has been more direct, and even tighter, than its tight control of Azad Kashmir. This situation may have led some Pakistanis to (falsely) believe that the Northern Areas/Gilgit-Baltistan was/ is already legally a part of Pakistan. This is incorrect. The Northern Areas/Gilgit-Baltistan is part of J&K—and therefore is part of the Kashmir dispute.

Azad Jammu and Kashmir (Azad Kashmir)

Located in the south-west corner of J&K, Azad Kashmir is the smaller of the two regions of Pakistan-Administered J&K, but with a larger population than Gilgit-Baltistan.²⁷ The region’s capital since February 1949 has been Muzaffarabad. While not legally part of Pakistan, Azad Kashmir is heavily integrated into Pakistan, which has administered, and dominated, this region since 1949. When anti-Maharaja, pro-Pakistan rebels established Azad Kashmir on 24 October 1947, they claimed that their administration not only was the true representative body for all of the people of J&K, but also that it was the actual government for all of the princely state. From soon after partition until the United Nations-brokered ceasefire on 1 January 1949, Azad Kashmiris and their Azad Army fought to ensure that J&K joined Pakistan. From around May 1948, their fight was also one of survival as the Indian Army started to gain the upper hand. The Pakistan Army then entered J&K to support the Azad Kashmiris. Until the 1949 ceasefire ended fighting in J&K, Azad Kashmiris had a large degree of autonomy. This was partly because Pakistan was pre-occupied with many other issues and partly because the rugged Azad Kashmir region was mostly difficult to access, except in its south around Mirpur. Soon after the ceasefire and with the People’s Plebiscite expected to be held soon, Azad Kashmir disbanded its army, after which its fighters returned to non-military occupations either at home or in nearby areas of Pakistan. Thereafter, Azad Kashmiri politicians also deferred to Pakistan, with which nation they strongly wanted their region to unite and which was mounting the diplomatic campaign for J&K to join Pakistan. The Azad Kashmiris’ strongly pro-Pakistan stance contrasted with some leaders in Indian J&K, such as Sheikh Abdullah, who equivocated between wanting J&K to be independent and wanting it to be with India.

A major blow occurred to Azad Kashmiris’ pride and political standing in 1947 when Pakistan did

not grant *de jure* (legal) recognition to Azad Kashmir. Indeed, Pakistan has never granted *de jure* recognition to Azad Kashmir. Instead, Pakistan has only accepted Azad Kashmir's *de facto* (actual) existence. This is why Azad Kashmir only has an Interim Constitution—it is interim until Azad Kashmir's international status is finally resolved and accepted by all, including Pakistan. The lack of *de jure* recognition has irked some senior Azad Kashmiri leaders, such as the founding President of Azad Kashmir, Sardar Ibrahim, who believed that this weakened the Azad Kashmiris' cause and their movement's status as a genuine rival in J&K to Sheikh Abdullah and his administration and, indeed, to Pakistan ultimately winning J&K. However, Karachi took this stance because it wanted, and expected, Pakistan to secure all of J&K. In the early years, the Kashmir dispute was a zero sum game in which either India or Pakistan would obtain all of the former princely state. Had Pakistan granted *de jure* recognition to the Azad Kashmir region alone, this would have created a precedent that would have politically divided J&K into separate areas that had different, and in some cases seemingly resolved, statuses, as per the aspirations and wishes of each particular region's population. This pseudo or *de facto* division of J&K into its various pro-Pakistan and pro-India parts, therefore, would have weakened Pakistan's chance of obtaining all of the former princely state, including Kashmir, via the People's Plebiscite. For its part, India considered Azad Kashmir to be illegal, irrelevant and a creation of Karachi's imagination—despite evidence to the contrary. Nevertheless, for New Delhi, Azad Kashmir did not actually exist. Rather, Pakistan was controlling and running this area. Additionally, New Delhi considered that the administration in place in Indian J&K was the legitimate government for all of J&K, including for those areas of J&K that comprised 'Pakistan-Occupied Kashmir' and which Pakistan should vacate. To Azad Kashmir's detriment and to the betterment of both India and Indian J&K—for its part, Pakistan did not seem perturbed—in August 1948, the UN only recognised the Azad Kashmir administration as a 'local authority'. This was because 'Pakistan has not given formal recognition to the "Azad Kashmir Government" ... [and] having no international standing, the organisation can have no international responsibility'.²⁸ This effectively reduced Azad Kashmir's status to that of a municipal-type body—a local authority—in charge of providing limited services in a smallish area. Pakistan thereafter has treated the Azad Kashmir region and administration as such.

From 1949 to 1970, Pakistan ruled the Azad Kashmir region directly, and autocratically. It did so through its Ministry of Kashmir Affairs from 1949 and/ or through military-controlled administrations after 1958. As a result, until 1970, Azad Kashmiris had a limited local administration and a controlled political system that was almost totally beholden to the Rawalpindi-based Ministry of Kashmir Affairs. The MKA was powerful. It governed Azad Kashmir via a document called the 'Rules of Business'. While ostensibly passed by Azad Kashmir's only political party, the Muslim Conference, this document was heavily influenced in its formulation by the MKA. The only exception was the first set of 'Rules', as a consequence of which Azad Kashmiris had significant powers. Thereafter, however, the Azad Kashmir Government was to consult the MKA on almost all issues, with the MKA's Joint Secretary being the final arbiter on all major matters. The majority of important decisions was taken in Rawalpindi, not Muzaffarabad. The MKA was also notorious for treating Azad Kashmiri leaders and officials with disdain. It was able to exert such highhandedness as Azad Kashmiris, informed by the Maharaja's lack of democratic credentials, had instituted a system in their region in which only one party was permitted and operated—and therefore, while powerful locally, it was easily dominated by a more powerful Pakistani organisation. All Azad Kashmiri politicians necessarily were members of the Muslim Conference, with its officials solely responsible for running Azad Kashmir after its establishment on 24 October 1947. Additionally, this party was superior to the

administration, with the Muslim Conference President, who served as the Supreme Head of the Azad Kashmir Movement, being superior to the Azad Kashmir President. Because all Muslim Conference members were pro-Pakistan by inclination, any elections needed to elect officials or administrators, etc., were held within the confines of the Muslim Conference. That is, the Muslim Conference organised and ran all elections, with all candidates for office being Muslim Conference members. Until 1970, the only exception to this exclusive procedure was the military-sanctioned Basic Democracy elections held in 1961. Nevertheless, while partyless, reasonably informed Azad Kashmiris were able to recognise candidates' political leanings. This was because Azad Kashmir has a strong *biradari*—brotherhood, clan or tribe—system in which people know who is a member of their own tribe or clan and vote accordingly.²⁹

Azad Kashmiris tolerated their inferior relationship with Pakistan, Pakistan's MKA and Pakistanis until 1970, when Pakistan's martial law government ironically granted Azad Kashmir its first multi-party democratic political system. Azad Kashmiris were tolerant because they had nowhere else to go—physically, politically or economically. Indian J&K was an unattractive option, as was India. China, Afghanistan and the USSR were inaccessible. Azad Kashmir also was totally dependent on Pakistan for support, arms, manufactured goods and many foodstuffs. Equally, Azad Kashmiris, who invariably were strongly pro-Pakistan, were prepared to endure whatever 'their' nation did to them. Things slowly improved, particularly in 1970 when Pakistan's military-controlled government granted Azad Kashmir a very liberal presidential system of government. The regime in Islamabad was then under significant political pressure, particularly as it tried to placate severely disgruntled East Pakistanis. This constitution was the most liberal constitution that has ever existed in South Asia. Reflecting Article 370 that supposedly applied to Indian J&K, Pakistan's control was limited to foreign affairs, defence and communications. Azad Kashmir controlled all other matters. This moved it from being a municipality to a region with significant autonomy (but with limited funds or fundraising ability). Things changed after the loss of East Pakistan/ Bangladesh, the compaction of Pakistan, and the sidelining of the military. In 1974, the popular and elected politician, Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, changed Azad Kashmir's political system to a prime ministerial one in which Azad Kashmir 'enjoyed' restricted, and significantly curtailed, functions. Most power also lay with Pakistan via a body called the Azad Kashmir Council, which essentially was a type of upper house. While this gave Azad Kashmir an enduring political system that generally reflected those in place in Pakistan's provinces, once again, Azad Kashmir essentially became a glorified municipality. This arrangement was unique in the subcontinent until 2009, when Gilgit-Baltistan received a similar system.

Since 1974, Pakistan has again dominated Azad Kashmir. It does so, firstly, through the Azad Kashmir Council. It effectively ties Azad Kashmir to Pakistan through its legislative powers and control, and through its financial capability to collect taxes in, and dispense money and largesse to, the deficit and dependent Azad Kashmir region. Pakistan's control is enshrined via Schedule III of the Azad Kashmir Interim Constitution, which details the respective responsibilities for Islamabad and Muzaffarabad. Pakistan controls all major and important aspects of the relationship; Azad Kashmir's functions are essentially low-level, municipal-type ones. The Azad Kashmir Council meets three times a year, or so, in Islamabad. The Pakistan Prime Minister is chairman. Council members include five senior Pakistan ministers and eight Azad Kashmiris: the Azad Kashmir President and Prime Minister, plus six members elected by the Azad Kashmir Legislative Assembly. Advantageously for them, the Pakistanis on the Council invariably are politically unified, while the Azad Kashmiris may not be. Although the Azad Kashmir Council meets rarely, it does give Azad Kashmiris some access to the powerful Pakistan Prime Minister and to some of his senior ministers. Pakistan also uses its

Minister of Kashmir Affairs and Gilgit-Baltistan to ensure Pakistan's will in Azad Kashmir. This minister controls the Azad Kashmir Council's Islamabad-based Secretariat; he determines and decides on important non-Council matters. Pakistan's strong military presence in Azad Kashmir, while chiefly there to defend the region from Indian forces, can also ensure local pliancy if required. For example, the Pakistan Army was used to quell two serious uprisings in the Poonch area in 1950–51 and 1955. Pakistan also maintains its superior position with Azad Kashmir by embedding five senior 'lent officers' in paramount positions in the Azad Kashmir administration, even though Azad Kashmiri officers are available to fill these posts. These lent officers comprise the Secretary General/Chief Secretary, who is the region's senior bureaucrat, the Finance Secretary, Accountant-General, Inspector-General of Police, and the Chief Engineer/Development Commissioner. This follows a tradition started by the senior Maharaja of J&K who lent administrators to the junior Raja of Poonch. Lent officers ensure that Pakistan's bidding is done in Azad Kashmir. Finally, it is difficult for the Azad Kashmir Prime Minister to hold office unless Islamabad approves of him. There is a long history of the person ruling Pakistan ensuring that he or she had a local surrogate in control in Azad Kashmir. As the local saying goes, 'The road to ruling Muzaffarabad passes through Islamabad'.³⁰

Since 1970, Azad Kashmir has had an elected Legislative Assembly. Genuinely free and fair presidential and general elections were held in October 1970. Arguably, these were the freest and fairest elections ever held in South Asia. There was no manipulation or rigging by Azad Kashmiri political parties, the Pakistan military, or the MKA. Again, this may have been because Pakistan was heavily distracted dealing with the deteriorating situation in East Pakistan. Equally, idealistic Azad Kashmiris may have wanted to experience the new and novel experience of voting for what it was, rather than manipulating polls. There were further elections in 1975, 1985 (during the Pakistan military's martial law from 1977 to 1988), 1990, 1991 (after Islamabad sacked the recalcitrant Azad Kashmir Prime Minister), 1996, 2001, 2006 and 2011. All of these elections were closely 'overseen' by Pakistan, both within Azad Kashmir by Pakistani bureaucrats and/ or soldiers, and in Pakistan via twelve manipulable seats reserved for refugees displaced from J&K since 1947 by fighting or other actions. Although the Muslim Conference still exists—its current leader, Sardar Attique Ahmed Khan, is the son of Sardar Mohammad Abdul Qayyum Khan, a former freedom fighter, Muslim Conference leader and Azad Kashmir Prime Minister and President—Pakistan-based political parties have increased their presence in Azad Kashmir. The current Azad Kashmir Prime Minister (unlike Indian J&K, Azad Kashmir has not changed this nomenclature), Chaudhry Abdul Majeed, from Mirpur, belongs to the Pakistan People's Party (PPP). The Leader of the Opposition, Raja Farooq Haider, who is from Muzaffarabad, is a member of the Pakistan Muslim League (Nawaz) (PML (N)). This marks a positive change in Azad Kashmir politics: the man in power in Azad Kashmir does not have to be from the same party as the person in power in Islamabad. Thus, Chaudhry Abdul Majeed from the PPP is not from Nawaz Sharif's PML (N).

The Azad Kashmir Legislative Assembly now comprises 49-members in which six seats are reserved for specialist members and two seats are reserved for women. All Azad Kashmiri electoral candidates and legislators must swear allegiance to J&K joining Pakistan. Those who refuse to do so, such as members of the Jammu Kashmir [sic] Liberation Front (JKLF), a party whose stance of independence for all of J&K is popular with some Azad Kashmiris, are barred from contesting elections. Azad Kashmiris do not elect representatives to Pakistan's National Assembly or Senate, although J&K State Subjects residing in Pakistan ('refugees') can participate in Pakistani elections. Significantly, these refugees also elect twelve members to the Azad Kashmir Legislative Assembly.

This allocation of seats actually discriminates against residents of Azad Kashmir, as their electorates are generally numerically larger, making their vote worth less than a vote of J&K refugees located in Pakistan, particularly Kashmiris, whose electorates generally are very small. A negative development in Azad Kashmir is the number of members of the Legislative Assembly, excluding the Prime Minister, who currently have ministries: twenty-five (of forty-nine) members.³¹ Half of all members therefore have ministerial rank and privilege. Two of these are women. This situation is compounded because Azad Kashmir has its own large bureaucracy, with the government being the major employer in this economically backward region. However, Azad Kashmiris also can join the Pakistan Public Service, which has a two per cent quota reserved for them, or the Pakistan Army, in which there is an Azad Kashmir regiment (headquartered at Mansar, Punjab, but not exclusively populated by Azad Kashmiris). When travelling internationally, Azad Kashmiris use Pakistan passports. They must carry (Pakistan) National Identity Cards.

Overall, Azad Kashmir is a deficit region that is highly dependent on Pakistan. One simple example of this situation is that the easiest way to travel between Azad Kashmir's two biggest cities of Muzaffarabad, in the north, and Mirpur, in the south, is via Rawalpindi, in Pakistan, not through this mountainous region itself. Another concern is employment. With land holdings generally small and poor throughout Azad Kashmir, many Azad Kashmiris look to Pakistan for short- or long-term employment. Some also work overseas, with many Pakistanis and their descendants in the United Kingdom actually being originally from the Mirpur District of Azad Kashmir. This link began during Dogra times when Mirpuri men joined the 'mercantile marine operating from Indian ports' in large numbers.³² After World War II, many Mirpuris settled in the UK, partly to help overcome a labour shortage there. A further influx occurred after the Mangla Barrage was enlarged to dam size in the 1960s, flooding old Mirpur town in the process. Mangla Dam is now an important water storage wholly located within Azad Kashmir but which, significantly, provides irrigation water for downstream areas in Pakistan only and which generates large amounts of hydro-electricity, mostly for consumption by Pakistanis. Since 2004, Islamabad has paid Azad Kashmir royalties for Pakistan's use of Mangla Dam. This was done to appease disgruntled Azad Kashmiris, as well as to sweeten Islamabad's decision to raise the height of the dam wall to overcome capacity issues caused by excessive sedimentation. Around the same time, Azad Kashmir was given approval to develop hydel on some of its significant fast flowing rivers, which are ideal for small-scale hydel production and which some Azad Kashmiris leaders had long wanted to approval to develop. Pakistan had previously denied permission because the Kashmir dispute remained unresolved, with it is being possible that any such investments might be lost should J&K-ites ever vote for their state to join India.

The presence of the overseas Azad Kashmiri diaspora is important, particularly Mirpuris. They 'control one-third of total liquid assets estimated at \$60 billion held by Pakistanis abroad', while Mirpur itself is a 'superior' city 'primarily [built] based on savings made by Mirpuri earners overseas'.³³ Mirpuris have been, and still are, an important source of foreign exchange remittances to Pakistan, but a source of grievance for the Azad Kashmir Government which would like direct access to these funds. Increasingly, some Mirpuris are calling themselves 'Kashmiris' because of their links with the former princely state of 'Kashmir'. Some also have tried to use their electoral 'muscle' to influence the UK's position on the Kashmir dispute. Many have returned to Azad Kashmir, where some support the JKLF, partly as a way to try and extract benefits for their area from the Azad Kashmir and/ or Pakistan governments. An unknown number of Azad Kashmiris work in South-West Asia, where they invariably are considered to be 'Pakistanis', if only because they must travel using a

Northern Areas/Gilgit-Baltistan

The Northern Areas/Gilgit-Baltistan is a large region that spreads to the north and north-east of Azad Kashmir. The capital of the region is the city of Gilgit, located in the western part of the region; Skardu, in the easterly Baltistan area, is the region's other major city. Since mid-November 1947, people in the Northern Areas—more formally called the 'Federally Administered Northern Areas'—have had almost no say in running their affairs. Rather, Pakistani political agents, administrators and bureaucrats have ruled the Northern Areas, particularly in its earlier years via two separate agencies of Gilgit and Baltistan. Pakistan's Minister for Kashmir and Northern Affairs (KANA; or variations thereof of this title) has overseen these administrators, or residents, since this position was transferred from the control of neighbouring NWFP in 1950. This was in line with the 'Heads of Agreement' that Pakistan officials had signed with Azad Kashmiri leaders in April 1949, one specific item of which clearly gave Pakistan control over 'All affairs of the Gilgit and Ladakh areas under the control of the political agent at Gilgit'.³⁴ The senior KANA minister in the Pakistan Government still supervises this distant region through the Ministry of Kashmir Affairs and Gilgit-Baltistan, as his ministry is currently called. Although Pakistan has directly administered the Northern Areas since 1947, the region has not had any constitutional protection or rights under the Pakistan Constitution. United Nations resolutions also did not specifically mention this area, although UNCIP officials did visit it and talk with local dignitaries in 1949. When travelling internationally, people from Gilgit-Baltistan use Pakistan passports. They must carry (Pakistan) National Identity Cards.

Most people in the Northern Areas have been very pro-Pakistan since 1947. However, increasingly but somewhat retrospectively, some people now believe that a provisional government formed in Gilgit in November 1947 as a result of a local anti-Maharaja/pro-Pakistan uprising was sidelined after only fifteen days of existence when Major Brown, the British Commander of the Gilgit Scouts, single-handedly 'betrayed the revolution' and invited Pakistan to govern the area.³⁵ An anti-Maharaja uprising certainly took place in the Gilgit area in early November 1947. Anti-Dogra dissidents also possibly established a rudimentary Provisional Government in which one Raja Shah Rais Khan was nominally president.³⁶ Major Brown, however, is a controversial figure about whom opinions vary considerably, including in relation to whether he 'betrayed the revolution'. In 1947, Brown certainly had no power to institute any renunciation of the popular uprising as he was not in charge of it, or of those rebelling, nor did he have any administrative standing as the British had returned control of both the Gilgit Agency and Gilgit Leased Area to the Maharaja of J&K on 1 August 1947. Nevertheless, Pakistan's administration did seriously impose itself on the Northern Areas from late 1947 via the Frontier Crimes Regulations (used to police troublesome tribal areas in neighbouring NWFP), via various Punjabi and Pukhtoon bureaucrats, and by allowing, or encouraging, large numbers of Punjabi, Pukhtoon and Hazara migrants of the Sunni persuasion to enter this Shia-dominant region. These migrants lacked State Subject status. Equally, some Pukhtoos and Hazara from NWFP entered the Gilgit and Skardu areas to fill the 'commercial vacuum' created following the departure, forced or otherwise, of Hindu and Sikh businessman in 1947.³⁷

A major change occurred to the Gilgit and Baltistan areas following the division of J&K by fighting in 1947 and by the imposition of the ceasefire line throughout J&K in 1949. Fighting closed the oldest and easiest land route to Gilgit from (Indian-controlled) Srinagar via Burzil Pass; the (supposedly) uncrossable ceasefire line meant that this route was no longer available. Instead, the

best way to access Gilgit was via a 'jeepable' road from Rawalpindi and Abbottabad, via Mansehra and the difficult Babusar Pass, or via the more distant, northerly and equally difficult route from Peshawar, via Chitral, to Gilgit. Similarly, telegraphs that had previously gone to Srinagar in 1947 were sent by radio to Peshawar.³⁸ The situation was even more difficult for people in the Skardu area whose traditional transport and economic links had been to the south with Kargil, in the princely state's Frontier District Province. Skarduites became very isolated after the ceasefire essentially and permanently divided J&K in 1949, with all of their goods needing to be transported from Rawalpindi to Skardu via the even longer Gilgit route, or in limited amounts by air, which was expensive. Improvements made by Pakistan to the road from Rawalpindi to Gilgit, the so-called 'Indus Valley Road', from 1959–65 improved life for Gilgitis and Skarduites. So too did the opening of the all-weather Karakoram Highway (KKH) in 1978, which made it much easier for people and goods in Gilgit and Skardu to get to mainland Pakistan, and vice versa. Additionally, Gilgit became the KKH's 'focal point', as a result of which it apparently experienced an economic boom in the mid-1990s.³⁹

During Zulfikar Ali Bhutto's period in office (1971–77), the administrative situation improved slightly for people living in the Northern Areas. Local rulers of former princely entities such as Hunza and Nagar lost their (limited) local powers and privileges; use of the draconian Frontier Crimes Regulations was ended; the region was reorganised along more modern lines similar to those existing in Pakistan. Around 1972, both the Gilgit Agency and the Baltistan Agency were merged as districts into one administrative unit under a Pakistan Commissioner. A third district, Diamer, in the south-west, also came into existence. Each of these districts was headed by a Deputy Commissioner. In 1974, however, the State Subject status was removed in relation to the Northern Areas/Gilgit-Baltistan. This meant that non-State Subjects have been able to purchase 'non-moveable property'—that is, land—in this region. One significant consequence of this privilege is that serious demographic change has occurred in the Northern Areas/Gilgit-Baltistan: the percentage of Shias has reduced from 80 per cent in 1947 to about 55 per cent in the early 2000s.⁴⁰ The presence of large numbers of Sunni Punjabi, Pukhtoon and Hazara migrants appears to reflect a conscious attempt by Pakistan officials to alter the ethnic and religious composition of this region to make it easier for (Sunni-dominant) Pakistan to assimilate the region into the nation. This has led to increased sectarian violence, with some nasty instances of Sunni-Shia rioting at times, particularly in, and since, 1988. Nevertheless, the Northern Areas/Gilgit-Baltistan is still the only Shia-majority area either of Pakistan-Administered J&K or of Pakistan, to which nation it *de facto* belongs. Some disenchanted Gilgitis and Baltis, however, who have long felt neglected because of having little involvement in their political fate (until recently), have wanted to see the establishment of an autonomous Karakoram Province as Pakistan's fifth province. Some even seek a separate 'Balawaristan'. This 'land of the highlanders' would comprise Gilgit, Baltistan and Ladakh from J&K, as well as Chitral and Kohistan from Khyber-Pakhtunkhwa Province, both of which regions are located west of Gilgit and south of Chitral (and are sometimes called Yaghistan). Pakistan naturally opposes the creation of Balawaristan.

Another significant development is the proposed construction of water storage facilities in, or near, Gilgit-Baltistan. The most important project is the Diamer-Bhasha Dam on the Indus River, which will be located near the border of Gilgit-Baltistan with Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. To ensure Pakistan's untrammelled control of the project's major infrastructure, the dam wall and powerhouses that will generate 4,500 megawatts (MW) of electricity will be located in Pakistan; most of the water storage area will be located upstream in Gilgit-Baltistan. (Islamabad learnt this positional lesson from experience because Mangla Dam, from which dam Pakistan receives almost all of the benefits, is actually located in Azad Kashmir, a situation that has provoked Azad Kashmiris, at times, to voice

their desire strongly for more control over, or to obtain more revenue from, Mangla.) The Diamer-Bhasha Dam's water will flood 200 sq. km of Gilgit-Baltistan, including 100 km of the strategic Karakoram Highway. It also will displace 28,000 people in twenty-seven villages and submerge some significant archeological sites. Another project is the Bunji Hydropower Project on the Indus River south of Gilgit, which will have a capacity of 7,200 MW. Both hydel projects may involve Chinese construction assistance and finance. In 2006 and 2009, India protested respectively against the Bhasha and Bunji projects because they would be located in what New Delhi considers to be 'Indian territory illegally occupied by Pakistan'. Islamabad rejected both protests stating that, as per the United Nations resolutions, J&K is disputed territory. The language used by both nations in 2006 was moderate as they were then engaged in their 'Composite Dialogue', one matter of which was 'Jammu and Kashmir'. In 2009, the language was stronger, with Pakistan stating that India had 'no *locus standi*' (standing) in the 'construction of the Bunji Dam in Azad Jammu and Kashmir [sic]'.⁴¹ This was a startling error as Bunji is actually located in Gilgit-Baltistan. It is not clear whether Pakistan's Ministry of Foreign Affairs made a mistake with the geography, was obfuscating, or its officers, like many Pakistanis, were ignorant about this remote area (as also are most Indians).

In September 2009, Pakistan finally granted the Northern Areas/ Gilgit-Baltistan a participatory political system with some effective administrative power. This appears to be modelled largely, but not totally, on Azad Kashmir's political system. Since the late 1960s, Pakistan has attempted, not with very much conviction, to give the people in the Northern Areas some say in their affairs and administration. In 1969, Pakistan's military regime granted these people the Northern Areas Advisory Council. It was, however, always subordinate to Pakistan's Resident. In 1994, this body became the elected Northern Areas Executive Council. Islamabad allowed Pakistani political parties, which seem to have begun operating in the region in the 1970s during Bhutto's rule, to contest elections to this body, but not Azad Kashmiri political parties. Like its predecessor, this body had no genuine power to legislate or administer. In 1999, the Pakistan Supreme Court ordered the establishment of the Northern Areas Legislative Council and suggested that people in the Northern Areas should have full legislative and administrative rights, as per other Pakistan citizens. However, the Supreme Court failed to follow up on its judgment and this body remained a powerless advisory one under the control of the all-powerful Pakistan Resident in the Northern Areas. Most recently, in September 2009, Pakistan's Ministry of Kashmir Affairs and Northern Areas issued an edict, signed and ratified by Pakistan's President Zardari, titled the 'Gilgit-Baltistan (Empowerment and Self Governance) Order 2009'.⁴² The aim of this edict was 'to provide greater political empowerment and better governance to the people of Gilgit-Baltistan'. The Northern Areas was renamed 'Gilgit-Baltistan', with the Ministry of Kashmir Affairs and Northern Areas soon after similarly becoming the Ministry of Kashmir Affairs and Gilgit-Baltistan. The edict also acted as a type of constitution. It gave the region a Governor, appointed by Pakistan. It provided a thirty-three-member Legislative Assembly in which twenty-four members are directly elected and nine seats are reserved, with six for women and three for technocrats. And, it nominated aspects of how Gilgit-Baltistan should be administered. The Gilgit-Baltistan Legislative Assembly, which must meet at least three times each year, can legislate on sixty-one municipal-type subjects. The region has a relationship with Pakistan via the fifteen member Gilgit-Baltistan Council, in which Pakistan has eight members and Gilgit-Baltistan has seven. The Council presumably meets in Islamabad, although the Order does not confirm this. Nor does it say how often this body should meet or when the next elections should be held in Gilgit-Baltistan.

While the 2009 political system was a long overdue advancement for people in Gilgit-Baltistan,

the ‘Gilgit-Baltistan (Empowerment and Self Governance) Order 2009’ appeared to assume that this region is already part of Pakistan. This becomes clearer when comparing the political systems of Gilgit-Baltistan and Azad Kashmir. While similar in the sense that both regions have a Council that links them to Pakistan, the two region’s political systems vary in some significant ways. First and foremost, Islamabad used the Ministry of Kashmir Affairs and Northern Areas to impose this ‘Order’ on Gilgit-Baltistan. Conversely, the Azad Kashmir Legislative Assembly formally passed the Azad Kashmir Interim Constitution in 1974, albeit after Islamabad ‘authorised’ its introduction into the Azad Kashmir Legislative Assembly ‘for consideration and passage’.⁴³ Second, like Azad Kashmiris, Gilgit-Baltistanis, or GBians, as they call themselves, are not permitted to ‘propagate against, or take part in activities prejudicial or detrimental to the ideology of Pakistan’. However, unlike Azad Kashmiris, legislators in Gilgit-Baltistan do not have to swear allegiance to J&K joining Pakistan. Rather, they must swear that they ‘will remain loyal to Pakistan’, an oath that (incorrectly) seems to infer that their region’s status (as part of Pakistan) has already been resolved. The order also does not mention that only J&K State Subjects can purchase property in Gilgit-Baltistan. Instead, it states that ‘every citizen shall have the right to acquire, hold and dispose of property’, with a citizen being ‘a person who has a domicile of Gilgit-Baltistan’. This is a major weakening of the landowning situation in Gilgit-Baltistan. It also distinguishes people there from people throughout the rest of disputed J&K, where this status for citizens has not been diluted to this extent.

In November 2009, general elections were hastily organised and conducted throughout Gilgit-Baltistan. Some 717,000 thousand people turned out to vote for 264 candidates standing in twenty-four seats, of whom 165 stood as independents. The turnout itself was significant, given how quickly the electoral rolls had been finalised and given how cold the weather was in this region. While Pakistani political parties had ‘shown tremendous interest’ in the elections, there were some poll irregularities, with the supposedly apolitical Governor, Qamar Zaman Kaira, who also was a former Minister for Kashmir Affairs and Northern Areas, apparently campaigning for ‘his’ party, the Pakistan People’s Party, which party was then in power in Pakistan. This was a significant factor in the elections, if only because incumbency in Pakistan enabled PPP politicians to offer financial ‘incentives’ to voters and, very helpfully, to use local assets to campaign throughout Gilgit-Baltistan. It possibly was no surprise, therefore, when the ultimate winner of the elections was the PPP, which obtained fourteen seats. After it, came the Jamiat Ulema-i-Islam with three seats, the Pakistan Muslim League (Nawaz) and Pakistan Muslim League (Quaid) (PML (Q)) with two seats each, two independents, and then the Muttahida Quami Movement with a single seat. Although the elections were competitive, there were some election irregularities, with security considered to be insufficient and two seats having to be re-pollled because of a ‘law and order situation’ on polling day.⁴⁴ No pro-independence candidates won any seats, partly because of official efforts made to keep them from standing or campaigning. Thereafter, in the indirect elections conducted in the Legislative Assembly for the nine reserved seats, PPP won four (of six) seats for women and the three (of three) seats for technocrats. This gave it twenty-one seats (of thirty-three) in the Legislative Assembly—and a very healthy working majority. The other two seats reserved for women were won by PML (Q) and Jamiat Ulema-i-Islam.

In December 2009, Syed Mehdi Shah, a senior PPP member from Skardu, was elected unopposed as Chief Minister of Gilgit-Baltistan. He was supported by a senior minister and eleven other ministers, one of whom was a woman. Not surprisingly, Shah, who was the regional PPP leader, disputed any electoral malpractice. Seemingly, his opponents grudgingly accepted the results in order to help embed the nascent democracy in the region. This also was a reflection of the power equation

that impacts on both Gilgit-Baltistan and Azad Kashmir: ultimately leaders in Islamabad, political or military, have the final say in local affairs. With the PPP in power in Islamabad, many GBians considered that Gilgit-Baltistan would be better off locally if the region also had a PPP administration. Importantly, politicians and bureaucrats in Islamabad also control the financial resources allocated to the deficit region of Gilgit-Baltistan. This is a significant issue as about half of the Gilgit-Baltistan budget apparently comprises ‘non-development spending, i.e. spending on the governor’s, chief minister’s and ministers’ salaries and perks’.⁴⁵ While some GBians want Islamabad’s power and influence reduced to the point of Gilgit-Baltistan becoming administratively independent, other GBians want Gilgit-Baltistan to become a fully incorporated, and fully empowered, fifth province of Pakistan. In the short-to-medium term, neither is likely to happen. A number of other issues have been important locally. One is the ‘lack of transparency’ in some local appointments. Another was unpopular removal in 2014 of the subsidy for wheat transported to the area from Pakistan, which resulted in a unified strike by the Awami Action Committee coalition of various religious and political groups. Conversely, a positive development is that locally-elected politicians have administered Gilgit-Baltistan for the last five years. The region was due to have elections again in late 2014, these were postponed to the first half of 2015.

Significant challenges to J&K’s post-1949 status quo

Since 1949, two things have not changed in relation to J&K. First, despite the efforts of various Indians, Pakistanis and United Nations officials, the India-Pakistan dispute over J&K remains unresolved. Second, the people of J&K have not been consulted in any meaningful, inclusive or conclusive way about what international status they want for J&K. The Kashmir dispute therefore continues, a fact that ensures instability in the broader region. Apart from these two unchanged matters, fourteen other events have occurred in J&K since 1949 that have, or could have, altered the existing state of affairs, or status quo, in relation to the former princely state. These events have occurred between 1950 and 2005. They are discussed below in chronological order. Each event is significant in its own way in helping to understand J&K today.

1950: Dixon and the possible break up of J&K

In March 1950, the United Nations Security Council terminated the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan and, in its place, appointed a United Nations’ Representative for India and Pakistan. From May–September 1950, the eminent Australian High Court judge, Sir Owen Dixon, served in this position. He tried to overcome the various objections of India and Pakistan and conduct ‘a free and impartial plebiscite as the means by which the question of the accession of the State of Jammu and Kashmir to India or Pakistan would be decided’.⁴⁶ Fairly quickly, Dixon realised that both nations were unable to agree on the poll’s prerequisites. These included Pakistan’s demilitarisation from J&K and a concomitant reduction in Indian forces thereafter; what administration should exist throughout J&K during the poll; and, how to guarantee that voters would not be intimidated. Dixon also needed to address some significant political and physical obstacles to conducting a free and fair poll throughout J&K. Electorally, while J&K would have benefitted from having a unified and impartial administration, in actuality, three administrations with differing agendas operated: Indian J&K had Sheikh Abdullah’s National Conference administration, which was pro-India; Azad Kashmir had a pro-Pakistan administration; and, there was a pro-Pakistan

official from Pakistan in the Northern Areas. Various armed entities also could have sought to 'influence' the result in J&K, where people, in many ways, were still living apprehensively in a recent war zone while, concurrently, they expectedly awaited the holding of the UN-supervised plebiscite. Physical obstacles included J&K's difficult hilly-to-mountainous terrain, remoteness, and poor roads and communications. Two other issues were the lack of a current, inclusive electoral roll, and low levels of literacy among voters. All of these obstacles possibly were surmountable, but they required time, money, peace and stability, capable administrators, United Nations involvement, and, most challengingly, the combined goodwill and efforts of the India and Pakistan governments.

Given these factors, plus the strong India-Pakistan rivalry and antipathy and their inability to agree on very much, Dixon determined that a plebiscite throughout J&K was no longer viable. He further realised that people in Jammu and Ladakh were happy being with India, while Azad Kashmiris and people in the Northern Areas were happy being with Pakistan. Only people in Kashmir had unclear or uncertain political desires. After a series of meetings with the leaders of India and Pakistan, Dixon therefore suggested an option that was in line with his mandate 'to place before the two Governments any suggestion which in [his] opinion was likely to lead to the solution of the dispute'.⁴⁷ Dixon proposed that, first, in those areas of J&K where the people were strongly and clearly inclined to join either India or Pakistan, then these regions should actually join the nation to which these people were inclined; and, second, that only people in Kashmir needed to be polled. Secular India was prepared to countenance this suggestion under certain conditions, chiefly to do with its security forces and administration being in charge of Kashmir while the plebiscite was conducted. Initially, New Delhi also wanted an area under Pakistan's control included in the poll to be conducted for people in the Kashmir Valley. This area comprised the 'part of Muzaffarabad district to bring in ... the natural geographical feature provided by the river Kishenganga and its watershed to the north'.⁴⁸ While this was unclear, it may have included Muzaffarabad town, most of which was to the south of the Kishenganga, plus some additional Kashmiri-speaking areas. Essentially, it was a bargaining position, as India quickly came to accept a plebiscite for the Kashmir Valley region only. Pakistan, however, rejected any such regional-only plebiscite. Rather, it wanted the plebiscite conducted for all J&K-ites. If this was not possible, then Pakistan wanted a division of J&K along religious lines—as a result of which Pakistan naturally would have obtained all Muslim-majority areas, including the prized region of Kashmir. India would not contemplate any partition that included Kashmir, chiefly because, as New Delhi saw things, this would have rewarded Pakistan's aggression in J&K. In other words, this would have justified Pakistan's unilateral use of force to alter or resolve this issue.

Unable to get any further agreement between the leaders of India and Pakistan despite his best efforts, Dixon left the subcontinent on 23 August 1947, after which he completed a report to the UNSC. While Dixon had failed in his mission, two interesting matters arose from it. First, he was 'inclined to the view that no method of allocating the [Kashmir] valley to one or the other of the contending parties is available except [via] a poll of the inhabitants'. Second, that any settlement to the Kashmir dispute involved an India-Pakistan agreement to divide J&K 'and in some means of allocating the [Kashmir] valley rather than in an over-all plebiscite'.⁴⁹ In these, Dixon was perceptive. His proposals also marked the first time that the idea of a break up of J&K was floated and seriously considered by India and Pakistan.

From 1954: India no longer interested in People's Plebiscite

From about 1954, India lost interest in having the United Nations-supervised plebiscite held in J&K.

This was a pragmatic stance. From 1953, it was highly unlikely that India would ‘win’ any plebiscite conducted either in J&K or, if voting was restricted to Kashmir, in that region. Noticeably, India had become unpopular in Kashmir after Sheikh Abdullah was sacked from office and jailed in 1953. Thereafter, New Delhi deviously sought to suggest that the government in Indian J&K represented all of the people of disputed J&K and that, therefore, the United Nations-supervised plebiscite was no longer valid or necessary.

In July 1952, Jawaharlal Nehru and Sheikh Abdullah had confirmed via their ‘Delhi Agreement’ that Indian J&K was part of the Indian Union, but with some unique privileges. However, following Abdullah’s political demise, New Delhi steadily eroded the state’s autonomy and irreversibly integrated it into the Indian Union. Concurrently, India became disinterested in holding the People’s Plebiscite in J&K. One major reason was because, on 6 February 1954, the Indian J&K Constituent Assembly, now led by the necessarily, and genuinely, pro-India Kashmiri politician, Bakshi Ghulam Mohammad, unanimously reaffirmed Maharaja Hari Singh’s accession to India and requested closer formal links with it. This was a farce. The Indian J&K Constituent Assembly, which claimed to represent all of the former princely state, had no mandate for such a reaffirmation. Nor did this body actually represent all J&K-ites. Those under Pakistan’s administration had neither been franchised to vote in, nor had been able to participate in, the 1951 election of representatives to the Constituent Assembly. They therefore were not represented in this body in any way. (The Indian J&K Constituent Assembly and in its successor from 1957, the Indian J&K Legislative Assembly, nevertheless reserved twenty-five seats for representatives from Pakistan-Administered J&K. These seats were to be filled after J&K was reunified, presumably following the plebiscite. In 1998, although the Indian J&K Legislative Assembly was enlarged, the number of seats reserved for representatives from Pakistan-Administered J&K was decreased to twenty-four seats.) Finally, it is highly likely that the poll that elected the Indian J&K Constituent Assembly was rigged. This meant that the Constituent Assembly was not truly representative of people on the Indian-controlled side of J&K either. Nevertheless, India’s disinterest in having the People’s Plebiscite held dates from around this time. Almost certainly, India will never reverse its stance of not wanting to have this poll conducted.

Soon after Abdullah’s demise, India legally, diplomatically and increasingly, camouflaged its desire not to have a plebiscite conducted in J&K by stating that Pakistan’s joining of some Western-led military alliances fundamentally changed the situation by making the subcontinent part of the Cold War struggle. Pakistan had joined the South-East Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO; formed in 1954) and the Central Treaty Organization (CENTO, or Baghdad Pact; formed in 1955). SEATO’s members were Australia, France, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Philippines, Thailand, United Kingdom, United States. CENTO’s members were Iran, Iraq, Pakistan, Turkey, United Kingdom, with Iraq leaving in 1959 and the United States joining. For India, Pakistan’s membership of these powerful Western-led military pacts suggested that its neighbour either might undertake a ‘military solution’ to try and capture all of J&K or that Pakistan might create a situation in which extra-regional forces would be drawn into the Kashmir dispute in order to meet their treaty obligations—to India’s detriment. Conversely, Pakistan believed that India was stalling on the plebiscite, although, equally, Karachi was doing little to remove the various pro-Pakistan fighters from J&K, as the UN resolutions required.

Legally, India claimed that its changed stance on the plebiscite was *clausula rebus sic stantibus*: because of a fundamental change of circumstances, a treaty becomes inapplicable. For India, this trumped Pakistan’s legal position of *pacta sunt servanda*: agreements must be kept. This was a typical situation in the *sui generis* (unique) Kashmir dispute: India arguing one thing while Pakistan

argued the exact opposite, or vice versa. Concurrently, India also stated that the Indian J&K Constituent Assembly had unanimously reconfirmed J&K's accession to India in 1954 and that, therefore, it was the only legal government for J&K. As India saw things, the UN had only recognised the Azad Kashmir administration as a local authority, while Pakistan was directly, but illegally, ruling the Northern Areas. For New Delhi, all of these factors ended the matter of J&K's legal status and the need for a plebiscite. Politically, all of J&K was an integral part of India. Nevertheless, India displayed, and it continues to display, significant indifference to the Azad Kashmir and the Northern Areas regions, and their residents, which regions India has long claimed but has not never physically or administratively controlled.

Certainly, by 1975, the People's Plebiscite was well and truly 'dead'—for India, at least. In that year, Sheikh Abdullah regained his position as Indian J&K's Chief Minister, from which he had been sacked in 1953. To return to the political mainstream, Kashmir's most popular politician significantly agreed via his 'Kashmir Accord' with India's Prime Minister, Indira Gandhi, that Indian J&K was 'a constitutional unit of the Union of India' and that the accession of J&K to India was 'not a matter in issue'.⁵⁰ Pragmatically, Abdullah had abandoned the issue of J&K's status in return for obtaining power in Indian J&K. This arrangement included Abdullah renouncing the People's Plebiscite. His position also meshed with India's stance that all India-Pakistan disagreements, including the Kashmir dispute, should be resolved on the basis of the 1972 Simla Agreement. Despite some India-Pakistan discussions since then and despite Pakistan still wanting the People's Plebiscite to be held, there is minimal India-Pakistan agreement on anything very much and the Kashmir dispute remains unresolved.

1960: Indus Waters Treaty

One of the few successful agreements ever made by India and Pakistan was concluded in September 1960 when both nations agreed the Indus Waters Treaty. This involves rivers flowing through, or near, J&K, which was one reason why the princely state was important in 1947, particularly to downstream Pakistan. To mix a metaphor, the Indus Waters Treaty took much of the heat out of the highly significant India-Pakistan issue of water. That is, it resolved the problem of how the lower riparian nation, Pakistan, would be guaranteed adequate water from supplies controlled in almost all cases by the upper riparian nation, India.

The Indus Waters comprise the Indus River, the five rivers of Punjab—from west to east) the Jhelum, Chenab, Ravi, Beas and Sutlej—and the Kabul River. All of these rivers eventually flow into Pakistan. The Indus Waters Treaty essentially 'partitioned' the rivers of the Indus Waters system, except for the smaller, less significant Kabul River system, much of which rises in Afghanistan then flows through Pakistan's west and joins the Indus River at Attock. As all of the Kabul River's water was well beyond India's control, it (naturally) was given to Pakistan. Otherwise, the Treaty gave India exclusive rights to water in the 'eastern' rivers: the Ravi, Beas and Sutlej; Pakistan was given full control over water in the 'western' rivers: the Indus, Jhelum and Chenab. The Treaty also resolved how the complex system of canals and irrigation works located throughout divided Punjab would be used or altered to the satisfaction of both parties. Significantly, the Indus Waters Treaty was negotiated with the assistance of a third party, the World Bank. This international body had the skills and largesse to be able to patiently broker a deal that satisfied both nations. Importantly, it provided finance for new construction works, as did India. This enabled Punjab's complex irrigation network to be re-engineered to move water to satisfy Pakistan's irrigation needs. This also ensured that the

agreed India-Pakistan water sharing arrangements would work satisfactorily.

Water had long been a major factor in relation to J&K, with the princely state desirable for India and Pakistan because of this important factor. However, Hari Singh's accession gave India control of the upper (non-Pakistan) portions of the Indus, Jhelum and Chenab rivers that flowed through J&K, then into Pakistan, and on which Pakistan heavily relied. This effectively gave India control of the bulk of the Indus Waters system. Had Hari Singh acceded to Pakistan, only the upper reaches of the Chenab and Indus rivers would have been beyond Pakistan's control because of where they rise in India and China respectively—with the latter river also beyond India's control, of course.⁵¹ Pakistan's vulnerability to water interdiction became clear in April 1948 when India's (East) Punjab Government stopped the flow of water from the Sutlej River water to Pakistan's (West) Punjab region. This impacted on the irrigation of vital foodstuffs, particularly because the *kharif* crop was being sown, or was about to be sown (for harvesting in autumn). Pakistan naturally responded very negatively to this deprivation. Thus, water became an issue early in India-Pakistan relations. In May 1948, both dominions agreed the Inter-Dominion (Delhi) Agreement, which, twelve years later, led to the 'monumental achievement' of the Indus Waters Treaty.⁵² Seemingly, the water issue was resolved.

Since 1960, the Indus Waters Treaty has worked fairly well, although in recent years it has come under pressure for at least two reasons. First, Pakistan's large population growth since 1947 means that its per capita water availability for human purposes has fallen to critical levels. Additionally, Pakistan needs large amounts of water to irrigate land for agricultural production, chiefly food and fodder. Most of Pakistan's water needs come either from aquifers, in which water levels have been rapidly receding because water pumping has exceeded aquifer recharge, or from the Indus, Jhelum and Chenab rivers, which water is then moved via canals subject to high evaporation and leaking. Water quality is another issue for Pakistan. India also has a per capita water scarcity problem, but it has far more water options than Pakistan, including having, or being able to construct, more water storage facilities, including large dams, and having access to many more rivers. These include the mighty Brahmaputra, which carries enormous amounts of water, much of it collected from India's north-east, where states such as Meghalaya and Arunachal Pradesh are amongst the wettest areas in the world. In due course, both nations may 'benefit' from melting glaciers providing more water to the Indus Waters system. Better agricultural and irrigation techniques also could create water 'savings'. Similarly, desalination plants could help in urban areas, although these are expensive to build, plus they require regular supplies of electricity to operate, which is often currently scarce or irregular. Longer term, unless both nations can control population growth, or develop more efficient ways of using water, or invent new ways to 'create' water, particularly Pakistan, the prognosis is poor and water shortages will become a way of life, or death.

The second pressure on the Indus Waters Treaty has resulted from contentious construction issues arising between India and Pakistan. In the late 1980s, India started to build a project on the Jhelum River in the Kashmir Valley which it calls the Tulbul Navigation project and which Pakistan calls Wullar Barrage. For India, the aim supposedly is to make the Jhelum River navigable in summer; for Pakistan, the barrage will impede water flows. Then, in the 2000s, India built Baglihar Dam on the Chenab River. At Pakistan's insistence, the World Bank arbitrated this matter in 2007. Its decision made India lower the height of, but not remove, the Baglihar Dam's wall. Most recently, India and Pakistan have been competing to build almost identical projects in J&K. These comprise constructing tunnels to divert water from the Kishenganga River (as upstream India calls it) or the Neelum River (a newer name that downstream Azad Kashmir and Pakistan use) to the Jhelum River. Each diversion would apparently generate about 330 MW of hydro-electricity. However, downstream Azad Kashmir

would be worse off because the upstream Indian project, which is located on a part of the Kishenganga River in the Kashmir Valley before it crosses the LOC, would remove water from this river and reduce its flow. This, in turn, would reduce Azad Kashmir's capacity to generate hydel downstream on the Kishenganga/Neelum. In 2013, the Permanent Court of Arbitration arbitrated this issue. Its interim verdict in February allowed India to divert a minimum flow only from the Kishenganga for power generation (which India sees as a victory), not a full diversion (which Pakistan sees as a victory), and that India needed to maintain a minimum flow of water into the Kishenganga/Neelum River at a rate to be determined subsequently. In its Final Award in December, which is binding on both nations without appeal, the Court determined that the minimum flow rate should be nine cubic metres per second (cumecs) at all times. India or Pakistan may seek reconsideration of this decision seven years after the first diversion of water from the Kishenganga/Neelum River.⁵³

Water scarcity is one of Pakistan's most significant long-term issues. It is exacerbated because hardline Pakistanis (unfairly) blame upstream India for many of Pakistan's water problems, including flooding. For example, in September 2014, the influential spiritual leader of the Jamaat-ud-Dawa (Organisation for Preaching), Hafiz Saeed, disturbingly accused India of 'water terrorism' over floods that severely impacted on Pakistan (and on Indian J&K).⁵⁴ Jamaat-ud-Dawa is considered to be an alias for the Pakistani terrorist group, the Lashkar-e-Taiba (Army of the Righteous), which latter group is popular among some radical Pakistanis and which has long operated in Indian J&K. India-Pakistan rivalry over water is likely to worsen. J&K is one area where this rivalry could play out.

1962 China-India war—and subsequent rivalry

Since about 1954, the China-India relationship has been difficult. One major reason has been the unresolved issue of which nation should possess the remote region of Aksai Chin that India considers to be part of J&K, but which China does not. This is part of their ongoing dispute over much of the long, British-imposed China-India border and over some former British-controlled territory. Although India welcomed the Chinese Communist Party's victory in 1949 and although India duly recognised Tibet as being part of China from 1954, the China-India relationship nevertheless soured. Indeed, it became so poor that the popular Indian slogan of 'Hindi Chini Bhai Bhai'—'Indians and Chinese are brothers'—quickly degraded to 'Hindi Chini Bye Bye', particularly after both nations fought a war in 1962.⁵⁵ Since then, the China-India relationship has slowly improved, particularly in the area of trade. Even so, each of these significant Asian civilisations maintains substantial suspicion of the other aspiring great power. Their border and territorial disputes remain unresolved.

China-India difficulties started around 1954. Then, some Indian maps started to show the disputed Aksai Chin region as being part of India. This possibly was a self-perceived redress for India recognising China's control of Tibet. Matters worsened in 1957 when the Chinese published a map that revealed that China had built a road through the eastern part of Aksai Chin to link Kashgar with Lhasa. This was the Sinkiang-Tibet Highway, also called the Yehcheng-Gartok Road. Significantly, China had built this road without India knowing. Roads have been important symbols and functional devices for both nations. India is extremely reluctant to ever cede control of the Kashmir Valley because of the strategic road that runs from Srinagar, via Kargil, to Leh, the capital of Ladakh, and which is very important for the Indian military. Once called the 'Leh Treaty Road', vehicles transport significant amounts of men, materiel and munitions along it to re-supply India's forces confronting

China in the remote region of Ladakh. Only this road and a newer, more difficult road to Leh from Kullu (Kulu), Himachal Pradesh, via Rohtang Pass, provide India with any land access to Ladakh, although snow blocks both roads for long periods during winter. To partly obviate this problem, India is intending to build a tunnel underneath Zoji La on the Srinagar-Kargil-Leh road. For China, the Sinkiang-Tibet Highway is equally as important and symbolic. It allows China to access the remote Aksai Chin region and to re-supply its own troops stationed there.

In 1958, India made a formal and precise claim to the Aksai Chin region. Presumably, this belatedness was because Indians had been distracted by the array of post-British challenges in India and J&K. Equally, like the British a century before them, the Indians knew little about remote parts of J&K. Aksai Chin had not been mentioned in the 1941 Census of J&K; despite India's claim, it was not mentioned in the 1961 Census of Indian J&K either. India's claim to Aksai Chin therefore was a 'map claim': a claim made utilising an official map.⁵⁶ Before that, official Indian maps had shown an 'indeterminate' Indian claim on parts of far western China that possibly included Aksai Chin. In the 1950s, China made a similar map claim to areas of north-eastern India, where the British 'imperialists' had taken territory from China. Both nations essentially were engaging in cartographic aggression. India's claim to the Aksai Chin region is weak, being based on the Dogra Maharajas' previous, and rather dubious, claim of having owned and controlled Aksai Chin and because of British attempts to impose a more northerly border on China in this area. China contested these claims, stating that the 1842 Sikh-Dogra-China-Tibet Treaty restored the previous boundaries in the Ladakh area, including in relation to Aksai Chin, which previously had been under China's suzerainty. Equally, Nehru stated that India's claim to Aksai China was because of the same treaty.⁵⁷ A lot happened soon after 1842, including the actual creation of J&K in 1846, which brought the British into these territorial and border 'equations'. Equally, China exercised varying degrees of nominal or actual control in Aksai Chin, with this depending on the strength and reach of the regime in power in China. Arguably, China also knew little about this region. Some time after 1949, however, China enhanced its physical presence in, and its actual control of, Aksai Chin. Certainly, by the time of India's official claim in 1958, China was definitely in control of this remote but disputed region.

China-India tensions increased in 1959. Following major unrest in Lhasa, the Dalai Lama fled to India, arriving at Tawang, in the Tawang Tract region in north-eastern India that had long been sacred to Tibetan Buddhists. (Some people believe that the Dalai Lama will reincarnate at Tawang, which conveniently is outside China's control.)⁵⁸ Despite angering the Chinese, the Indians welcomed the Tibetan leader and granted him asylum. Concurrently, China-India rhetoric increased and relations worsened, chiefly because of varying interpretations of the exact location of the China-India border. Tibet is fundamental to this border: the China-India border extends along the southern edge of this politically unsettled region; nowhere is this border geographically contiguous with mainland China. Other factors included a Chinese perception that India might reverse its position on Tibet being part of China and that India might even try to free, or seize, Tibet. With the latter, India had some advantages: India's major population centres in the north were geographically closer to Tibet than China's major population centres in China's east; India and Tibet enjoy deep, ongoing, spiritual and religious links; and, India does not want to colonise and integrate Tibet. Ironically, however, despite disliking British colonialism, the Indians seemingly sought to emulate their former masters and advance the China-India border to India's advantage using an assertive, even aggressive, 'forward policy', particularly in the eastern sector of this border's three sectors. Thus, India claimed that the China-India border was located even further northwards of the border than the powerful British had imposed on a weak Tibet and had sought to impose on an unstable China. The China-India border in

the middle and western sectors was less contentious. Nevertheless, India moved military forces up to all of its border areas with China. These forces supposedly maintained defensive positions only.

From China's point of view, some of these Indian forces were in positions forward of the China-India border. This was because the (Communist) Chinese Government did not accept the earlier imposed border demarcations of the British or Indian attempts to similarly advance the border in India's favour. Instead, China sought to resolve these issues via negotiations with India. While this seemed a reasonable stance, China in the 1950s and 1960s suffered from a major popularity and credibility disadvantage that made this one-party-dominated state appear to be unreasonable or aggressive when compared with moderate, democratic India. There also then was considerable but overstated fear worldwide of the seemingly unified monolith called 'Communism' that comprised the USSR, China and other 'Reds' and which had aggressively been causing problems in Eastern Europe, the Korean Peninsula and in South-East Asia, particularly in Malaya, Vietnam and Indonesia. The influential Nationalist Chinese Government in Taiwan magnified such fears as it successfully demonised its rivals in mainland China. Taipei also agreed with Beijing's stance on the border issue with India. Despite some significant Indian assertiveness, intransigence and Nehruvian inflexibility, China invariably was seen as the 'bad guy'. Often uncritical international support for India made this nation feel stronger than it was. Equally, a belligerent India underestimated China's military strengths and capabilities and overestimated its own.

In August 1959, Chinese and Indian forces exchanged fire along the disputed border at Longju, in the eastern sector. One Indian soldier was killed. Thereafter, the overall situation steadily deteriorated to the point where India fought, and decisively lost, a short, sharp war with China from 20 October 1962 to 21 November 1962. Most fighting was in the heavy jungles of the remote North-East Frontier Agency (NEFA; established by the British in 1919 from parts of Assam Province). Alarmingly for India, the People's Liberation Army (PLA) badly mauled the inadequately equipped and poorly resupplied Indian forces, largely cleared NEFA of all major Indian forces, and advanced almost to Tezpur, 50 km south of the NEFA-Assam border. In the middle sector, there was minimal fighting. In the western sector, there was serious fighting, including in Aksai Chin, all of which region India nominally 'lost' to China. Initially, PLA forces quickly overran remote Indian outposts near Aksai Chin. After India redeployed troops to more defensible positions and sent reinforcements from the ceasefire line, Indian forces largely held the line in Ladakh. In all sectors, high altitude and remoteness were major problems, with some soldiers fighting at locations 16,000 feet above sea level. They had to deal with rare air, freezing weather, frozen ground that impaired bunker building, and a total lack of fuel for fires. At such altitudes, mules could not be used for transport, while local yaks were either unavailable or unmanageable. Additionally for India, its military intelligence had atrophied, with the civilian Intelligence Bureau apparently often providing (inadequate) reports. Indian politicians and some Indian Army generals had overlooked these significant difficulties before provoking China.

At midnight on 21 November 1962, China surprisingly declared a unilateral ceasefire. All PLA forces then withdrew to positions about 20 km from what became known as the Line of Actual Control. In the eastern sector, this roughly translated to the McMahon Line. The Chinese did this because, by 20 November, PLA forces were extended and isolated, the onset of winter was imminent, and the rapid military campaign had achieved all of its aims. It also had profoundly affected New Delhi, with Indian politicians' utterances now both measured on the China-India border and disavowing any forward policy. Nevertheless, some jingoistic Indians believed that, despite the Indian Army having just been trounced, Indian troops soon would have started winning the undeclared

China-India war. This was despite serious materiel shortcomings, alleviated after the UK and US sent military assistance five days after non-aligned, but desperate, India accepted US support on 29 October 1962. Thereafter, up to eight US transport aircraft daily delivered twenty tons per plane of military aid to India. Nevertheless, on 20 November 1962, a distressed Nehru urgently appealed to Washington to directly intervene against China. Fortuitously, the war ended the next day, which 'saved' Washington, which was still edgy after confronting the USSR a few weeks earlier during the Cuban Missile crisis, from having to make a decision. Concurrently, a pragmatic India started purchasing military equipment, including planes and helicopters, from the USSR, thereby instigating a highly advantageous materiel-based relationship that would continue until the USSR's demise. The US and UK, the largest foreign investors in India, continued to provide assistance to India (with both ending this during, and because of, the 1965 India-Pakistan war). Both nations pressured India to resolve the Kashmir dispute by conceding some of the Kashmir Valley to Pakistan. This pressure failed. Indians were prepared to resolve the Kashmir dispute, but not by ceding territory to Pakistan.

While India clearly lost the 1962 war with China, there were some 'positive' outcomes. The Indian Government that had been reluctant to spend money on military matters doubled its defence budget, which enabled India's military capabilities to be enhanced. A strong strand of wanting to avenge its defeat by China ran through the humiliated Indian Army for decades and impacted positively on its war fighting élan, with an arrogant Pakistan Army surprised by the Indians' willingness to fight in 1965 and 1971. (Indeed, the 1965 India-Pakistan war restored India's combat reputation.) Post-conflict, the Indian Army realised that it needed mountain divisions armed, equipped and able to be resupplied for high-altitude warfare, particularly against China. These forces served India well in 1967 during two major incidents with China in the Indian protectorate of Sikkim, through which the major road from India to Lhasa passes and which protectorate was incorporated into the Indian Union in 1975. In the early 1980s, mountain forces were again utilised when the Indian and Pakistani armies began their high-altitude warfare on Siachen Glacier. Similarly, in late 1987, after increasing tension and a China-India military build up along the border between Xizang (Tibet) and India's Arunachal Pradesh (NEFA until 1972; China calls this area 'southern Tibet'), an armed conflict was avoided when cooler heads prevailed and a de-escalation of forces occurred. Had there been war in 1987, Indian forces seemingly were better equipped and better supported by significant air assets than their Chinese opponents. They also were probably better motivated, with many Indian soldiers keen to extract revenge for India's 1962 military defeat. Conversely, China's primary focus since 1978 had been to develop its economy. The PLA's skills and capabilities possibly also were atrophying, as the 1979 China-Vietnam war had revealed.

During the 1962 China-India war, diplomatic relations were not severed. Nevertheless, India and China only conducted their first round of talks on their border and territorial disputes in 1981, during a time of improving relations. The talks essentially agreed to discuss their issues, without necessarily seeking any solutions at that stage, and to take steps to develop the relationship in other ways, including through trade and tourism. There was then a flurry of talks, with eight rounds in the next six years. Thereafter, talks were less regular, with the fifteenth round only held in New Delhi in January 2012. Even at this round, the signals were confusing. For India, both nations still 'continued their discussions on a framework for a resolution of [the] Boundary Question'; for China, the 'two sides ha[d] reached agreement on the political guidelines for the settlement of the boundary question'.⁵⁹ In previous years, some analysts believed that China might have been prepared to do a straight territorial swap: Arunachal Pradesh to India; Aksai Chin to China. More recently, China has been asserting itself in the eastern sector, suggesting that China either has not given up its historical claim

to the 'southern Tibet' area, or that it is probing for Indian weaknesses, or that it is trying to pressure India. China has also been active in the western sector, with incursions made in northern Ladakh from April 2013. China also has been engaging in 'passport aggression': depicting areas in dispute with India as Chinese territory in Chinese passports. For its part, India has decided to deploy aircraft and surface-to-air missiles and to raise two more mountain divisions to patrol and protect its side of the China-India border. Meanwhile, Beijing and New Delhi continue to discuss their border and territorial issues, including in relation to Aksai Chin and the western sector.

1963: China-Pakistan Border Agreement

In March 1963, Pakistan and China agreed a border between the Northern Areas, which was under Pakistan's administration and which Pakistan felt responsible to defend, and Xinjiang. This included some contested territory comprising the eastern Trans-Karakoram Tract of the Raskam and the Shaksgam valleys that had been under Chinese administration but parts of which rulers of Hunza traditionally claimed grazing rights over. Negotiations began after an announcement in May 1962 by the governments of China and Pakistan that they proposed to settle their border to develop good relations and to ensure tranquility. Consequently, under the 1963 Border Agreement, Pakistan claimed to have obtained 750 sq. miles of land from China. This appeared so: China had ceded territory that clearly had been under its control, with the new border alignment largely following the Macartney-MacDonald line that the British had proposed to China in 1899 and with which Peking seemingly, but not legally, had agreed. Thus, 'Pakistan gave up only map claims [while] China actually ceded some 750 square miles of territory'.⁶⁰ Conversely, India stated that this area legally was its and that Pakistan had 'no sovereignty' or right to 'trade away or to negotiate about' J&K.⁶¹ Paradoxically, India also claimed that Pakistan, although lacking sovereignty, had ceded 2,700 sq. miles of 'occupied territory' to China, which was based on the 'Johnson Line' of 1868. Coming shortly after India's humiliating defeat by China in 1962, the China-Pakistan Agreement only added to India's bitterness. It also partially soured discussions that started in late 1962 between India and Pakistan about J&K. New Delhi (reasonably) felt that its two neighbours might be colluding against India. To partially alleviate this concern, Beijing announced that the 1963 China-Pakistan Border Agreement was provisional: China would conclude a treaty with the nation that controls the territory in question when the Kashmir dispute is finally resolved.

For Pakistan, the China-Pakistan Border Agreement was one of the first major acts in the development of a substantial relationship with China that has seen China become one of Pakistan's strongest, closest and most reliable international allies. Although the border agreement followed soon after, and possibly because of, India's major loss in the China-India war, Pakistan had chosen not to take advantage of India's predicament during this war to advance Pakistan's position in J&K militarily or diplomatically. Possibly, this was because Pakistan's Western military allies, particularly the United States, indicated that Pakistan should not do so. Concurrent with China-Pakistan developing a close relationship, India and the USSR similarly developed a close, effective relationship that often countered the diplomatic, strategic and military benefits that Pakistan obtained from China. Most importantly, in August 1971, the India-USSR Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation discouraged China from assisting Pakistan in its war with India. Had China attacked India in the south, the USSR may well have attacked China in the north or possibly with nuclear weapons, a situation that Beijing decided was not in China's best interests and would be avoided. Thus, like the 1965 India-Pakistan war, China did not get involved militarily in the 1971 India-Pakistan war. Things

may have been different had China then enjoyed a better relationship with the United States. However, US President Richard Nixon only made his first official visit to China in 1972, after which US-PRC relations were eventually normalised in 1978 (to Taiwan's chagrin). Equally, the 1971 India-Soviet Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation may have been concluded because Henry Kissinger's secret visit to China in 1971 became public. Pakistan had been involved facilitating this visit undertaken to pave the way for Nixon's 1972 visit. Significantly, India was able to benefit for many years by receiving advanced Soviet weaponry and materiel, usually at concessionary prices. Ultimately, however, the demise of the USSR and the economic rise of China meant that Pakistan 'backed the right horse'. For Islamabad, China has become an 'all-weather friend'. Equally, some Pakistanis remember that its friend did not help militarily in Pakistan's wars with India in 1965 or 1971.

1965: second India-Pakistan war

In October 1958, the leader of the Pakistan Army, General Ayub Khan, seized power in Pakistan via a military coup. This ended a period of considerable political instability and indecisiveness in Pakistan. Thereafter, the Ayub-led military regime was able to stabilise the nation, partly because the Pakistan Army had no rival with the same degree of national coherence, organisation or reach. Equally, this regime was unaccountable and it often did whatever it wanted to. One such action occurred from around July 1965 when Pakistan injected some 1,000–1,200 undercover or irregular forces across the ceasefire line into Indian J&K. Known as 'Operation Gibraltar', the idea was to foment an uprising among Muslims in Indian J&K who, supposedly, were ready to rise against India. The operation was poorly conceived as Pakistan had neither consulted, nor informed, the J&K Muslims of its intentions, nor sought their support. Furthermore, contrary to some Pakistanis' (and, indeed, some Indians') belief, many Kashmiri Muslims then were actually pro-India and anti-Pakistan. Pakistan's underhanded activities and its use of force soon after the commencement of Operation Gibraltar instigated the second India-Pakistan war. Fighting went from late August to 22 September 1965. This was the second, and final, time that the Indian and Pakistan militaries fought specifically over J&K.

Pakistan was inspired to undertake its actions in J&K in August 1965 following a number of events, which Pakistan's military leaders generally misinterpreted. First, Pakistan felt that Indian forces had been weakened by India's loss in its 1962 war with China, soon after which Pakistan fortuitously began developing its strategic relationship with China. The second was in late 1963–early 1964, when some serious unease arose among Kashmiris after a sacred relic comprising a hair of Prophet Muhammad went missing from Hazratbal Shrine, Srinagar. With the help of India's Intelligence Bureau, the relic was recovered on 4 January 1964 and verified by Muslim clerics as being authentic. After G.M. Sadiq became Prime (later Chief) Minister in Indian J&K in 1964, peace and normalcy returned to the Kashmir Valley. Sadiq, who was an even more pro-India Kashmiri politician than Bakshi, tied the state even closer to India. Third, on 27 May 1964, India's revered leader, Jawaharlal Nehru, died. Pakistan judged (again falsely) that his successor, Lal Bahadur Shastri, would not be as keen to militarily retain Indian J&K. Fourth, in early 1965 Pakistan received some significant US weaponry, including Patton battle tanks. Some Pakistani soldiers felt that this gave Pakistan a military advantage over India. Fifth, in March–April 1965, some serious India-Pakistan skirmishing in northern parts of the Rann of Kutch led some Pakistani generals to consider that their new weaponry and military forces were superior to India's. They also sought to instil a

foolhardy belief among their soldiers that ‘One Muslim is worth ten Hindus’, a palpably false cry, as future events would show. Nevertheless, these various events convinced senior Pakistan Army generals to try and foment an anti-India revolt in Indian J&K, which they expected Kashmiris were ready to support. The generals’ expectation was that this operation would easily succeed.

Operation Gibraltar began in late July 1965. Heavy artillery firing across the ceasefire line by the Pakistan Army distracted Indian forces, enabling Pakistan’s irregular agents to cross this porous line and enter Indian J&K. Regular Pakistan Army units followed in late August–early September 1965 in a conventional military operation called ‘Operation Grandslam’, which aimed to capture Indian J&K, including the prized Kashmir Valley. Pakistan made some significant early gains, particularly in the southerly Chhamb sector of J&K located on the western side of the Chenab River close to both Jammu City and the important road from it to Poonch City via Rajauri and Nowshera. Chhamb was easily accessible from the important Pakistani industrial and cantonment city of Sialkot, from which the invading Pakistanis had departed (and from which city the lights of Jammu City can be easily seen). However, Pakistan’s initial attempts to capture territory in Indian J&K were foiled when Muslim Kashmiris failed utterly to support the intruding Pakistanis. Indeed, many Kashmiris delivered infiltrators straight to the Indian Army or to the local police, who independently also arrested many undercover Pakistanis. Similarly, China, under strong Western pressure, failed to open a second front against India, as Pakistan had expected. India also countered by sending its military forces across the international border into Pakistani Punjab around 6 September 1965. One Indian target was Sialkot. Another was Pakistan’s second city, Lahore, which was relatively poorly defended, chiefly because Pakistanis had not expected this Indian response.

When the Indian Army surrounded and threatened to capture Lahore, with both nations under intense pressure from the international community, and with their armies low on ammunition, a ceasefire was declared on 22 September 1965. Talks brokered by the USSR’s Prime Minister, Aleksei Kosygin, were held in January 1966 between India’s Prime Minister Shastri and Pakistan’s President Ayub. Ironically, these were held in Tashkent, Tsarist Russia’s first possession in Turkestan and its former capital of Turkestan, from which Russians schemed and played the Great Game. In its current iteration, Tashkent was the capital of Soviet Uzbekistan. The talks were inconclusive in resolving the Kashmir dispute, mainly due to Shastri’s unfortunate death during them. Nevertheless, the Tashkent Declaration agreed peace, to improve India-Pakistan relations, and to the *status quo ante*. Both nations’ militaries therefore returned to their previous pre-war positions in J&K, much to the chagrin and reluctance of some senior officers on both sides. Consequently, the Pakistan Army retired from territory obtained in Jammu, while the Indian Army relinquished some strategic passes that it had captured in J&K. For India, this included Haji Pir, the retention of which would have provided a considerably shorter route between Uri and Poonch City. Overall, war had resulted in nothing conclusive and little constructive. It certainly had not resolved the Kashmir dispute, while the people of J&K once more had endured another fight over their lands.

There were side effects of the 1965 India-Pakistan war. In November 1965, the UNSC discussed the ‘India-Pakistan Question’ for the final time. Thereafter, India’s increasingly close ally, the USSR, a permanent UNSC member, used its veto power to prevent discussion of this matter in the Security Council. Following Shastri’s death, Indira Gandhi became leader of the Congress Party and Prime Minister of India in January 1966. While considered by some to be a stop-gap and malleable, she would consolidate her rule of India and strengthen the nation vis a vis Pakistan. One precursor to the 1965 war was the Rann of Kutch incident, which the UN Secretary General helped to arbitrate. As a result of this arbitration that concluded in 1968, India and Pakistan reluctantly accepted a binding

arbitration that made India cede ten per cent of its part of the Rann of Kutch to Pakistan. Pakistanis were displeased because they had expected to obtain a larger amount of territory. Indians were greatly displeased because they believed that India had obtained sovereignty over the entire Rann of Kutch region in 1947 because of having obtained the ruler of Kutch's accession. Furthermore, Pakistan had again not been internationally condemned for its actions, even though it was the aggressor in 1965. Rather, Pakistan had been rewarded. This arbitration furthered New Delhi's distrust of the United Nations and, indeed, of third-party arbitration of any India-Pakistan disputes. Significantly, it encouraged Mrs Gandhi to formalise India's desire for bilateralism with Pakistan in the Simla Agreement in 1972.

From 1965: China and Pakistan become allies

As a result of the 1965 India-Pakistan war, Pakistan and China became even closer allies. For Pakistan, the United States and other military allies had been found wanting, including by withholding supplies of arms and ammunition. Conversely, China had effectively helped Pakistan both by supplying these, and diplomatically, although it did not provide any actual military forces or open a second front against India. In 1964, for strategic and tactical reasons, both nations secretly had agreed to establish a direct land link between Pakistan and China, which meant upgrading the old, and poor, Gilgit-Kashgar route. The 1965 India-Pakistan war accelerated this process. By 1969, a road suitable for four-wheel drive vehicles had been completed through very difficult terrain. In 1973, serious work began to make this an all-weather, two-lane highway. This became the Karakoram Highway, which was officially opened in 1978. Its completion was somewhat ironic, given how the British had tried to keep foreign influences, including China, out of this area.

The Karakoram Highway follows the old pilgrim route/Silk Road from Havelian, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, via Gilgit and the Kunjerab Pass, to Kashgar, Xinjiang. While it is an important strategic and physical link with China, this narrow road has regularly been subjected to closure by snow and/or landslides. In January 2010, a major landslide in upper Hunza buried Attabad village, killed twenty people, displaced 6,000 people, stranded 25,000 people in upstream villages, and created a large lake that submerged the road. Water transport is now needed to traverse this lake in order to rejoin the KKH. Beijing has talked of building a railway line from Kashgar to the recently built Pakistani port of Gwadar, on the Makran Coast in south-western Balochistan. A railway line already runs from Urumchi to Kashgar. Given the terrain and the need for extensive tunneling and bridge building, the works and cost would be significant in order to extend this railway line to Gwadar. Nevertheless, such a project would give China access to the Arabian Sea, which, for far western areas of China, is much closer to access than China's eastern ports. This link also would partly lessen China's major strategic vulnerability of having to transport much of its trade and oil needs via the Malacca Strait, a journey that includes sailing past India's territory of the Andaman and Nicobar Islands located strategically at the waterway's western entrance. Another proposal is to widen the KKH from 10 to 30 meters, tripling its transportation capacity, which would also be a major project. In 2006, a bus service began to operate between Gilgit and Kashgar using the KKH. Pakistan and China also had plans to commence a bus service between Islamabad and Urumchi using this route.⁶² I am unable to confirm if these two services currently operate.

The significance of the China-Pakistan relationship since 1965 is that India, in its strategic, diplomatic and military plans, must consider both nations operating separately or in concert against it. India needs a military capability able to fight simultaneously on two fronts against Pakistani and

Chinese forces. India also needs a second strike nuclear capability in the event of a nuclear war against one or the other nation, or against both. India has benefitted from having an ally that has been opposed to China and/or Pakistan, as the USSR was until its demise in 1991. However, changing strategic equations have moved China and Russia closer, while India and Russia have moved apart somewhat, partly because India and the US have moved closer, a factor that may lessen India's fears about China. Diplomatically, India must also consider a further complication: that as a permanent UNSC member, China has a veto power that it could use to India's detriment, while, equally, India can no longer rely on Russia's veto. Furthermore, in the last thirty-five years, Pakistan's strategic and military importance has been enhanced by the activities of foreign powers in neighbouring Afghanistan. The first was the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979, after which the US used Pakistan as a proxy to distribute arms to the anti-Soviet *mujahideen*. The second has been the US-led International Security Assistance Force's counter-terrorism activities in Afghanistan since 2001 and ISAF's need to engage with Pakistan and its security forces, including by providing arms and aid. These have enhanced Pakistan's counter-terrorism and war fighting abilities. Finally, India has concerns about Chinese military activity in the Gilgit-Baltistan area of 'Pakistan-Occupied Kashmir'. Most of this Chinese activity appears to be engineers, possibly from the PLA, attempting to re-open or enhance the KKH. Nevertheless, India remains wary as this area is north of, and within striking distance of, the highly militarised LOC, albeit via very difficult terrain. One small Indian gain has been that China's support for Pakistan is seemingly not unequivocal. In relation to the Kashmir dispute, Beijing has, on occasions, encouraged Pakistan to negotiate with India. Certainly, Beijing dislikes Pakistanis' support for Uighur terrorists who live, train and obtain succour in Pakistan's north-western areas. Pakistan's support for terrorism is a factor that gives China and India a common cause. Ultimately, it also could weaken the China-Pakistan relationship.

1971: third India-Pakistan war

In December 1971, India and Pakistan fought their third war. Pakistan lost decisively to India and was dismembered, with East Pakistan becoming the independent nation of Bangladesh. For the following six years, the chastened Pakistan military surrendered power to civilians led by the charismatic politician, Zulfikar Ali Bhutto. Unlike the 1948 and 1965 wars, the India-Pakistan war from 3–16 December 1971 was not directly over J&K, although some fighting took place there, with Indian forces doing better.⁶³ The most serious fighting was in East Pakistan, where between 300,000 to one million Bengalis fighting for their freedom were killed, including by the Pakistan Army. Pakistan was unable to benefit from China opening a second front against India as earlier New Delhi had effectively 'trumped' Beijing by signing the India-Soviet Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation. In order to support Pakistan, weaken an Indian Navy blockade and attempt to intimidate India, President Nixon deployed the US Seventh Fleet, led by the aircraft carrier *USS Enterprise*, to the Bay of Bengal. This belated action is one reason why India has since sought to develop a blue-water naval capability for its defence and as a deterrent.

While Pakistan's 1971 loss theoretically weakened Pakistan by removing one of its two 'wings', it actually made the remaining Pakistan nation more compact, more defensible, and militarily more potent, particularly as most members of the Pakistan military had traditionally come from West Pakistan. Additionally, soon after, and partly because of, its conclusive loss to India, Pakistan started a program to develop nuclear weapons, with Pakistan obtaining this capability in the late 1980s or early 1990s, almost certainly with Chinese assistance. Some of this development took place at

Kahuta, a city off-limits to foreigners located roughly midway between Islamabad and Rawalakot, in Azad Kashmir. This capability has largely negated any conventional military superiority that India enjoyed, with Pakistan prepared to use nuclear weapons in a war situation should Indian forces be overwhelming Pakistan. Pakistan also suffered a severe loss of 'face' in the 1971 war because, apart from its army being defeated, the Indian Army captured some 90,000 Pakistanis, including 56,000 military personnel and 22,000 paramilitary and police. One result of this has been that Pakistanis want to avenge their defeat in any way and place that they can against India. This sees Pakistan undertake various activities: the Pakistan military creates incidents along the LOC in J&K; Pakistani agents engage in nefarious 'foreign hand' activities, such as in north-east India, as India alleges; and, Pakistan utilises proxies in Kashmir or in India in a 'bleed-India-through-jihad policy'.⁶⁴

In the post-war Simla Agreement made in 1972 by India's Prime Minister Gandhi and Pakistan's President Bhutto, both leaders agreed that all India-Pakistan disputes thereafter would be bilateral matters to be resolved in peaceful ways. This included the Kashmir dispute. There would be no third party involvement, which meant, particularly for India, that the UN-supervised People's Plebiscite was definitely no longer on the agenda. Somewhat ambiguously, however, Simla stated that the United Nations' charter and principles were to govern India-Pakistan relations. Gandhi and Bhutto also agreed to adjustments along the LOC. Additionally, in relation to J&K, they may have concluded a secret and unwritten agreement to convert the Line of Control into an international border at some unspecified later date. Possibly coincidentally, in 1974, Bhutto changed Azad Kashmir's relatively liberal, largely Pakistan-free, presidential political system obtained in 1970 into a prime ministerial one. This brought Azad Kashmir into line with Pakistan's provincial political and administrative structure and made its full political integration into Pakistan possible. More likely, this change was about Bhutto re-asserting his, and Pakistan's, control over Azad Kashmir. Equally, post-1971, many Azad Kashmiris came to understand that Pakistani forces would not be able to 'liberate' or wrest J&K from Indian control. Pakistan's defeated and dejected military lacked the capability, and the will, to do so. This remains the case: a military solution to resolving the Kashmir dispute is not possible—by the forces of either nation.

In 1977, the People's Plebiscite again became sacrosanct for Pakistan. After its 1971 defeat and immediately post-Simla, Pakistan appeared to forsake the plebiscite and seek a negotiated settlement with India to the Kashmir dispute. Pakistan, which had plenty of other pressing political and economic matters to deal with, was 'licking its wounds' and consolidating. Following General Zia's coup in 1977 that imposed military rule on Pakistan and the Northern Areas, but not on Azad Kashmir, Zia thereafter dominated local politics and politicians. One casualty was Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, who met his political and physical demise in 1979 when Zia allowed him to be hanged on a dubious charge of murder. Other casualties were Pakistanis who experienced the physical wrath of Zia's imposition of Islamic *Sharia* law, including whippings, rigorous punishments and the need for thousands of female rape victims to produce male witnesses in order to be found innocent. In relation to the Kashmir dispute, Zia also re-instituted Pakistan's policy of calling for a UN plebiscite to resolve J&K's international status. Pakistan claimed that, according to Simla, this was still possible as the UN charter and principles were to govern India-Pakistan relations. From about 1982, Zia also cleverly sought publicly to extract the Northern Areas from the Kashmir dispute by claiming, incorrectly, that the people there were Pakistanis and had nothing to do with J&K. Zia's claim was reflected by his imposition of martial law directly in the Northern Areas, but indirectly in Azad Kashmir, where cowed politicians instituted a temporary constitutional amendment that empowered Zia and excused his and his military's actions. Official Pakistani maps also showed the Gilgit Agency

as being separate from J&K or as being part of Pakistan. This also was incorrect.

From the early 1980s: Siachen Glacier

In the early 1980s, India and Pakistan deployed troops on Siachen Glacier ('Siachen'), in the Saltoro Range area of north-eastern J&K where the LOC had never been demarcated. Siachen Glacier is 6,700 meters (22,000 feet) above sea level, 75 km long, and between 2–8 km wide. It is located 50 km north of map point NJ 980 420 in north-eastern J&K, the point to which the ceasefire line in J&K had been demarcated in 1949, after which the ceasefire line went 'north to the borders'. For India, this meant the line went north-west; for Pakistan, it meant north-east; Siachen Glacier was located roughly in the middle of these two imaginary lines. In 1949, the ceasefire line was not demarcated beyond NJ 980 420 chiefly as no one had envisaged anyone making a military lodgment in this remote, high and inhospitable area. A further reason was that India and Pakistan did not agree about where J&K's international border with China, which was close to Siachen, was located.

It is not certain which nation started the futile, costly and ongoing exercise to tactically and strategically outflank the other by capturing the glacial high ground of undemarcated J&K, and thereby improve their nation's position in the state. It seems that India first sent soldiers to Siachen around May 1983; by August 1983, the Pakistan Army had noted their presence on the glacier. Possibly, India had deployed troops in response to sightings of Pakistani activity in the Siachen area, including military patrols and mountaineering expeditions on nearby peaks, such as K2 (Karakoram 2), the second highest mountain in the world. India also may have been opportunistically looking to outflank Pakistan, particularly in relation to the Northern Areas, or to prevent Pakistan from gaining access to the nearby strategic, but no longer used, Karakoram Pass to Siachen's east, beyond which lay Pakistan's closest ally, China. (The Karakoram Pass is not to be confused with the Kunjerab Pass located further north on the KKH.) For India, the Siachen area was also strategically important in terms of its defence against China, and in relation to their border and territorial dispute over Aksai Chin and the eastern Trans-Karakoram Tract ceded by Pakistan to China in 1963. For Pakistan, having forces in this area was important, partly because it could not let India obtain any strategic advantage in J&K, but also to protect the Northern Areas and the important KKH link with China. In the ensuing military contest, India obtained most of the superior tactical positions on the higher ground.

Since January 1986, India and Pakistan have sought to demilitarise Siachen Glacier. It is costly to equip, acclimatise, transport, maintain, supply, and then de-acclimatise, high-altitude forces involved with this campaign. A few years ago, the cost for India was around USD 1 million each day. Pakistan's costs are less due to shorter supply lines, although the cost is relatively higher because of Pakistan's smaller and weaker economy.⁶⁵ Another reason is the sheer inhumanity of combat there: most soldiers who die on Siachen do so from the devastating effects of the inhospitable cold, due to exposure, altitude sickness and other associated diseases, or as a result of natural calamities such as avalanches—not from actual fighting. Indian and Pakistani negotiators have not been able to overcome the significant mistrust that exists between both nations and their armies—the so called 'trust deficit'—and demilitarise the Siachen area. One way that this trust deficit plays out is with the Indian Army unusually 'playing politics' via the Indian media about its distrust of the Pakistan Army. More than once, Indian generals have called for 'cast-iron' or 'iron clad' internationally-enforceable guarantees from Pakistan that, should Indian forces ever withdraw from Siachen, the Pakistan Army would not seek to capture the tactically superior positions that the Indian Army now holds. Pakistan

has not been able to satisfy India on this matter. The Siachen ‘contest’ therefore continues, although there is little active or actual combat. In some ways, Siachen is the ‘litmus test’ in India-Pakistan relations: if New Delhi and Islamabad can overcome their mutual distrust and resolve this particular issue, then the resolution of other matters becomes possible.

From 1988: Kashmiris’ anti-India uprising

In 1988, Muslims in the Kashmir Valley began an uprising to liberate Kashmir from India by engaging in protests and political activities. The following year, this uprising became violent. Many Kashmiris hated India. They intensely disliked their international status as Indian citizens. They found it distasteful that local pro-India politicians had compelled Kashmiris’ subservience to India. In particular, Muslim Kashmiris disliked how India had manipulated and oppressed them going back at least to Sheikh Abdullah’s dismissal in 1953. This included: allowing pro-India Kashmiri leaders foisted on Indian J&K to politically rig elections, or to allow them to be rigged; the steady and stealthy abrogation of Indian J&K’s special constitutional status and the binding of the state administratively to India and Indian institutions; and the severe lack of local employment opportunities coupled with India’s economic exploitation of Kashmir’s water assets. The final straw was the rigged 1987 elections in which the local Muslim United Front did not win the number of seats that many Kashmiris had anticipated. Thereafter, some young disenchanted Kashmiri Muslims, often educated and usually unemployed, crossed the LOC to Azad Kashmir where elements in the Pakistan Army, usually from the Directorate of Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI), provided them with ongoing training and arms. Significant political unrest in Kashmir began in 1988. This included anti-India protests and consequential curfews. From July 1989, this unrest became violent after militants detonated a bomb at the Srinagar Telegraph Office. In May 1990, unknown assailants assassinated a leading Muslim Kashmiri cleric, Mirwaiz Maulvi Farooq, in Srinagar. Some 200,000 Kashmiris attended his funeral. When nervous Indian security forces opened fire on attendees, twenty were killed. Thereafter, the militancy erupted. It had considerable local support.

The Kashmiris’ anti-India uprising was unexpected. Few outsiders saw the signs of the Kashmiris’ significant unease. Many also considered Kashmiris to be passive, timid, non-martial people resigned to their fate who would never ‘take up the gun’ to resolve matters. Initially, Kashmiri members of the pro-independence JKLF led the insurgency. After about 1993, so-called ‘foreign’ militants—that is, non-Kashmiris—played the major part. This occurred mainly because Pakistan started to support pro-Pakistan militants only, not the JKLF. This severely weakened the JKLF, although some of its members concurrently had decided to renounce violence as a political tool. In its early stages, the insurgency was highly popular, destabilising and nerve wracking for India. Its forces were under significant pressure from the militants, plus they were unpopular with Kashmiris often subjected to excessive and nerve wracking cordon and search operations, household and personal searches, and indiscriminate, but frequent, identity checks. The uprising did not, however, spread to Jammu or Ladakh, where people were strongly pro-India and disliked Kashmiri domination. While severely disenchanted with India, many Kashmiris also slowly came to realise that Pakistan was not necessarily any better. They disliked Islamabad’s selective support for pro-Pakistan militants and its blatant, and brutal, use of them to fight a proxy war against India in the Kashmir Valley, with little thought or concern for Kashmiris’ wellbeing. Consequently, many Kashmiris came to consider that Pakistan, like India, was only interested in obtaining Kashmiris’ land, not in their welfare.

Over time and as ‘war weariness’ set in amongst Kashmiris, India’s paramilitary forces stabilised

the Kashmir Valley. By about 1999–2000, many fatigued Kashmiris simply wanted peace and normalcy to return to their region. Among other things, this would enable Indian and foreign tourists to visit and stay in Kashmir, thus helping Kashmiris to begin a climb back to economic prosperity. Conversely, money became a factor that encouraged the militancy to continue: anti-India militants got money from Pakistan to fight in Kashmir; some Indians patrolling the LOC allegedly took bribes to ‘allow’ militants to cross into Indian J&K; Indian paramilitary forces received money, allowances and equipment to fight in J&K; Kashmiris made money out of having such a large Indian military and paramilitary presence throughout the Kashmir Valley; and, some Kashmiris also got money from providing sanctuary and support to anti-India militants. At the time of writing (2014), the insurgency has died down and many Kashmiris appear to be resigned to their region staying with India. There are only some 100 militants still operating, sixty per cent of whom are foreign. Violence has been at its lowest levels since 1989.⁶⁶ The failed insurgency, along with previous India-Pakistan wars, strongly suggests that, even though some Kashmiris want Kashmir to join Pakistan, this nation cannot take Kashmir by utilising direct military action or by using indirect proxy forces. Equally, some Kashmiris, chiefly Hindu Pandits and businessmen appreciative of India’s greater economic opportunities and potential, want Kashmir to remain in the Indian Union. If asked in any meaningful way, the majority of Kashmiris probably would like Kashmir to be independent from both India and Pakistan.

The Kashmiris’ anti-India insurgency has been ugly. While it was largely confined to the Kashmir Valley, anti-India militants did attack remote parts of Jammu close to Kashmir. In Kashmir itself, militants attacked the Indian security forces and, for many years, ruled the streets at night. However, as the Indian security forces became better organised and more capable, militants increasingly had to operate in rural areas. India also ‘turned’ some militants, who Kashmiris call ‘renegades’, and used these counter-militant groups to successfully, but often brutally, attack other militants. As support for the militancy waned, militants sought to intimidate wavering Kashmiris, they killed rivals and dissenters, and they tried to incite inter-religious violence through attacks on rural-based Sikhs or Pandits. The militants also sought to discredit the 150,000–300,000 Indian paramilitary forces moved into Kashmir to suppress the uprising, such as the Border Security Force, the Central Reserve Police Force and the Rashtriya Rifles, by blaming them for the violence in Kashmir. The Indians were not without blame. Repressive powers obtained from draconian legislation, particularly Indian J&K’s Public Safety Act (1978), and India’s Armed Forces Special Powers Act (1958) and Terrorist and Disruptive Activities (Prevention) Act (1987), boosted these forces’ capabilities. Their powers included the ability to arbitrarily detain suspected militants or anti-social elements, to impose curfews, and to issue ‘shoot on sight’ orders. Paramilitary forces undertaking combing operations to clear areas of Kashmir from perceived militants intimidated, interred, tortured and sometimes killed an unknown number of Kashmiri males. They harassed and raped an unknown number of Kashmiri females. A whole generation of young Muslim Kashmiris has known only militancy.

Conversely, while Islamabad denied it, Pakistan gave anti-India militants sanctuary, training and support from the inception of the Kashmiris’ 1988 uprising. The Pakistan Army’s shadowy ISI was the main organiser and provider of such support. This was confirmed by no less than General Pervez Musharraf, Pakistan’s former President and Chief of the Pakistan Army. In October 2010, he publicly stated that Pakistan had formed ‘militant underground groups to fight India in Kashmir’ and that it was ‘the Pakistani security forces that trained them’.⁶⁷ Support and training for anti-India militants was mostly provided in Azad Kashmir, in nearby areas of neighbouring NWFP/Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, and in Punjab. Some militant organisations, such as Lashkar-e-Taiba, also provided training to anti-India

militants via camps in Afghanistan or Pakistan. Possible militant groups that Pakistan or Pakistanis supported to operate in Indian J&K included: Jammu Kashmir Liberation Front (until about 1993); Hizbul Mujahideen (Party of Holy Warriors; predominantly comprising Kashmiris); Harkat-ul-Jihad al-Islami (Islamic Struggle Movement; formerly run by an Azad Kashmiri from Kotli, the late Ilyas Kashmiri); Lashkar-e-Taiba; Jaish-e-Mohammed (Army of Muhammad); Harkat-ul-Mujahideen (Movement of Holy Warriors); and, Al-Badr (Full Moon). Pakistan also provided militants with arms and ammunition, while its forces regularly created diversions to help militants cross the heavily-patrolled LOC into Indian J&K. To stem such activities, India has fenced, mined and alarmed about 550 km of the 740 km-long LOC. Pakistan reduced its support significantly for anti-India militants after 9/11 in the US and the concomitant world pressure on states not to support international terrorism and ‘terrorists’ (who formerly invariably were called ‘militants’ or ‘insurgents’). Nevertheless, Pakistani support for anti-India militants still occurs to some extent, with higher levels occurring when India-Pakistan relations are poor. Pakistan considers these militants to be a relatively easy and cost effective ‘tap’ that Islamabad can ‘turn on’ at a time of its choosing to cause India problems. Such proxies can be used in Indian J&K or against ‘targets of opportunity’ in India, of which there are many undefended and undefendable sites, such as occurred in Mumbai in November 2008.

Since the Kashmiris’ anti-India uprising began, most Kashmiris believe that over 50,000 Kashmiris have been killed by militants or by India’s security forces. According to a semi-official Indian website on ‘Fatalities in Terrorist Violence 1988—[February] 2014’, there were 47,234 ‘Incidents’ (until 2002), 14,673 ‘Civilians’ killed, 6,095 ‘Security Force Personnel’ killed, and 22,756 ‘Terrorists’ killed, for a total of 43,524 fatalities.⁶⁸ This figure does not include some 10,000 Kashmiris, mostly comprising young men, believed to have disappeared or been ‘disappeared’ by security forces. Concurrently, psychological disease has increased exponentially, with women bearing the brunt of the militancy and this disease. Almost all of the small and intimidated Hindu Pandit community has fled to Jammu City or New Delhi, where often they live as refugees in difficult circumstances. The once Happy Valley became an unhappy hell, as I witnessed in 1996 when I visited sullen Srinagar and ghostly Gulmarg. Usually, the heavily-militarised summer capital was quiet during the day as Indian paramilitary forces maintained law and order. At night, it became deadly and dangerous as militants ruled totally darkened streets. Further away, the deserted ski resort of Gulmarg was totally devoid of skiers and visitors, with only one miserable, miserly and lonely tea stand in operation. Kashmir has now largely returned to normal, with few militant acts occurring, with the number of cross-LOC infiltrations down, and with large numbers of Indian and foreign tourists visiting Kashmir annually. The Kashmiris’ anti-India uprising seemingly resulted in nothing conclusive and little constructive. India had shown, and continues to show, a strong commitment both to retaining Kashmir and to denying Kashmiris’ desires for *azadi*. Conversely, many Kashmiris remain morose, dissatisfied with India, and desirous of *azadi*.

1998: India and Pakistan confirm their nuclear capabilities

In 1998, India and Pakistan confirmed what most analysts already believed: that each had a nuclear capability. In May 1998, India conducted five tests of nuclear devices in the Pokhran area of Rajasthan. India’s rationale was that it needed a nuclear capability to be able to defend itself from nuclear-armed China, which had first successfully tested a nuclear device in October 1964. Later in May, Pakistan similarly conducted six tests in the remote Chaghai Hills area of Balochistan.

Pakistan's rationale has been that, if India has nuclear weapons, Pakistan must also have them for self-defence, but also partly for pride. Perversely, given that India tested a so-called 'peaceful' nuclear device in 1974, Pakistan's tests made the overall tally of India-Pakistan nuclear tests six-all. More seriously, the tests by both nations confirmed that it is now most unlikely that either nation's military forces can, or ever will, capture all of J&K. India and Pakistan now almost certainly have more than 100 nuclear weapons each. Pakistan is considered to be in the numerically ascendant position having possibly—and staggeringly—over 200 nuclear weapons, according to a respected US analyst.⁶⁹ Most other analysts consider that Pakistan has about 120 nuclear weapons, while India has around 100. Some of these Pakistani 'nukes' may be low-yield (as against high yield) tactical, or theatre, nuclear weapons, which capability Pakistan considers to be a force multiplier and deterrent to a conventional attack by India.⁷⁰ In the event of another India-Pakistan war over J&K, either side could use some of their nuclear weapons to prevent the other from obtaining an absolute victory.

The India-Pakistan dispute over J&K is now considered to be a 'nuclear flashpoint': an event or location that could 'spark' a war that could escalate to a point where nuclear weapons could be used. Some Kashmiris I have met fear that India and Pakistan could fight a limited nuclear war in Kashmir. Indeed, according to one Kashmiri, in such a war if 'nukes were ever used, Kashmir would be the first target'.⁷¹ The high mountains that surround the Kashmir Valley make the area resemble a giant basin or arena, with these mountains possibly preventing, or at least reducing, the spread of nuclear fallout beyond Kashmir. Whether this is feasible or not, what matters is the Kashmiri perception. At present, an India-Pakistan war in, or over, J&K seems unlikely. Nevertheless, since 1998, India and Pakistan have increased their arsenals of nuclear weapons and their abilities to deliver these to distant locations using short-, medium- and, for India, long-range ballistic missiles. India has a 'no first use' policy (as does China): it will only use nuclear weapons if attacked with nuclear weapons by an adversary. Pakistan's policy is that it will only use nuclear weapons defensively: that is, it will use such weapons if attacked by an adversary, regardless of whether this attack is conventional or nuclear. In 2002, when an India-Pakistan war looked imminent following the terrorist attack on India's Parliament in December 2001, Pakistan's leader, General Musharraf made it clear that, if India and Pakistan went to war, Pakistan would use nuclear weapons 'as a last resort' if Pakistanis' 'backs were against the wall'. (Musharraf had seized power on 12 October 1999 via a military coup, one week after democratic India had concluded its general elections.) While Musharraf's statement possibly was rhetoric, it also provided a chilling warning to India, and a reminder to all, that Pakistan has a significant nuclear capability. So too does India. Nuclear weapons, and both nations' ability to deliver these using ballistic missiles, have raised the scope and scale of the potential destruction that any future India-Pakistan war could wreak. The prospect of even a small or limited nuclear exchange between India and Pakistan is a sobering thought—not just for those Kashmiris who consider themselves vulnerable.

1999: the Kargil 'war'

In May 1999, pro-Pakistan 'militants' mounted an operation along a 150 km stretch of the LOC in the strategic Kargil area of western Ladakh/ southern Baltistan in eastern J&K. Although Islamabad denied it, many of these 'militants' were local soldiers from the Northern Light Infantry, a body formed around 1975 by amalgamating the Northern Areas' Gilgit Scouts, Northern Scouts and Karakoram Scouts. A Pakistan Army general always commands this paramilitary force that Pakistan arms, equips and trains. Another Pakistani general, General Pervez Musharraf, who was then Chief of

the Pakistan Army, almost certainly ordered the Northern Light Infantry into battle in 1999. To make them appear to be anti-India militants, the Pakistani soldiers did not wear uniforms. Pakistan's then Prime Minister, Nawaz Sharif, claimed to have had no prior knowledge of the Pakistan Army's intentions in the Kargil area.

The Dras-Kargil area is one of the world's coldest locations, with Dras itself claimed by some to be the second coldest inhabited town in the world. Indian and Pakistani soldiers in this section of the LOC would annually vacate their bunkers and camps in elevated, isolated and weather-prone areas that became snowbound in winter, returning in spring when temperatures had risen sufficiently. From around March 1999, anti-India 'militants' advanced some 8–12 km across the LOC into Indian territory and took up advantageous and/ or former Indian positions, many of them elevated, in some 130 locations in the Kargil, Dras and Batalik sectors of the LOC. Surprisingly, Indian intelligence and reconnaissance operatives failed to notice these major, and hostile, intrusions. One intention of the anti-India forces was to cut the strategic Srinagar-Leh road near Kargil town, which was located a little further south from the LOC, and to hold this territory, thus disrupting India's major supply route to Ladakh. For India, this road is one of only two land routes into this remote region. It is usually closed from about November to mid-June by winter snowfalls. The other Kullu-Leh route also is closed at similar times by snow. Consequently, the Kargil road was, and is, of enormous strategic importance in terms of supplying, supporting and replenishing Indian troops defending Indian territory on the China-India border and on Siachen Glacier.

An Indian Army counter offensive involving bitter and difficult fighting resulted in over 1,000 deaths, making this a war, according to some definitions. Ultimately, exposed Indian forces, fighting uphill bravely and sometimes brazenly, recaptured the lost ground. They were supported, after some initial problems with the altitude and with targeting, by Indian air power, an asset that the so-called 'militants' could not access lest this destroy Pakistani claims that they were irregulars. Militants, after all, usually don't possess air forces. The Shias who populate Kargil were supportive of India. Indeed, these Shias, some of whom apparently look to Iran for spiritual leadership, preferred being with secular India, which may be the second most populous Shia nation in the world, than joining Islamic Pakistan, where Shias were concurrently being targeted in nasty sectarian violence. The United States assisted India's international position by applying some significant pressure on Pakistan to cease and desist. Washington wanted Islamabad to withdraw, or to encourage the withdrawal of, the 'militant' forces occupying Indian territory. Concurrent with the fighting, India-Pakistan relations plummeted. These had been improving following the earlier bus trip by India's Prime Minister, Atal Behari Vajpayee, to Lahore and his very amicable meeting with Pakistan's Prime Minister, Nawaz Sharif, in February 1999.⁷² One result had been the instigation of some seemingly promising 'back channel' discussions about a final solution to the Kashmir dispute between R.K. Mishra, for India, and Niaz Niak, for Pakistan. The Kargil war ended these discussions, with Vajpayee particularly feeling betrayed. A second outcome was that soldiers from both armies must now stay on the LOC all year round and in all weathers.

The Kargil war confirmed India's determination not to lose any territory that it holds in J&K, especially any near the strategically important Srinagar-Kargil-Leh road. Replicating India-Pakistan wars in 1948 and 1965 when Indian forces were doing well militarily, New Delhi chose not to try to capture further territory in J&K. It chose not to alter the status quo on the ground. For nuclear-armed Pakistan, while its forces lost the battle in Kargil, Islamabad succeeded in getting the Kashmir dispute back on the international agenda, with the President of the United States, Bill Clinton, publicly, and significantly, describing the LOC in J&K as 'the most dangerous place in the world today' in March

2000, and pondering whether this was ‘an ethnic conflict or a religious one?’.⁷³ Apart from attempting to block India’s road to Ladakh, internationalising the Kashmir dispute had been another one of Islamabad’s objectives. Equally, the Kargil war showed how Pakistan’s military actually ‘calls the shots’ in strategic and military policy in Pakistan to the disadvantage, or even total ignorance on occasions, of Pakistan’s supposed political leaders. Most importantly, the Kargil war showed that India and Pakistan, despite confirming their nuclear capabilities twelve months earlier, could fight a limited conventional war without it going nuclear. This created a precedent that, hopefully, won’t be repeated as there is no guarantee that any future India-Pakistan conflict would not escalate to a level where nuclear weapons would be used.

2001: Terrorism

While not actually changing the status quo in J&K, two significant events perpetrated by pro-Pakistan militants involved in J&K marked the first two major terrorist incidents in the world post-9/11. One of these acts was perpetrated in J&K; the second was in India. On 1 October 2001, suicide bombers from the Jaish-e-Mohammed organisation attacked the Indian J&K State Assembly in Srinagar and killed forty people. This attack was not widely reported, partly because media coverage from the Kashmir Valley was poor and partly because of the West’s pre-occupation with the serious terrorist events in the US shortly before. Nevertheless, the attack in Srinagar was the first major terrorist incident after 9/11. Then, on 13 December 2001, terrorists from Jaish-e-Mohammed and Lashkar-e-Taiba attacked the Indian Parliament in New Delhi. This was the second major terrorist incident after 9/11. Both militant bodies clearly coordinated their actions, probably with some oversight by elements from the Pakistan Army.

Pakistanis’ propagation and use of terrorism is controversial, to say the least. Many Indians don’t understand why hardline and frustrated Pakistanis use terrorism as a weapon against India. One reason is that many Pakistanis feel grossly insecure about India, their larger, stronger, more powerful neighbour who these Pakistanis (falsely) believe does not accept Pakistan’s existence and that it wants to reintegrate its recidivist neighbour into India. Another factor is that India, on occasions, is either diplomatically unapproachable, immovable or even plain intransigent on issues, including J&K. Using extra-legal forces to attack India is therefore a cheap, cost effective and asymmetrical way for Pakistanis both to vent their frustrations and to strike at the stronger nation and cause it problems. A major issue of this Pakistani approach involves the official levels of state support for terrorists, either by the provision of direct assistance via organisations such as ISI to help terrorists to operate, or by turning a ‘blind eye’ towards terrorists’ activities and operations supposedly undertaken legitimately through charitable organisations located in southern Punjab, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa and Azad Kashmir. Such an approach has caused Pakistan serious problems. Apart from this being totally unacceptable to India, Pakistan has had to deploy its own military forces to north-western parts of Pakistan to battle Taliban elements there attacking ordinary Pakistanis and the state. Islamabad is coming to realise that controlling covert extra-legal agents who develop and prosecute their own agenda without their handlers’ sanction is deeply problematic.

Equally, many Pakistanis have little understanding of how significant the 2001 terrorist attack against the sacrosanct Indian Parliament was on the Indian psyche. It led to widespread demands by Indians for India to take action against Pakistan for its support of anti-India militants and anti-India terrorism. Some suggested that Indian forces should cross the LOC and attack places in Azad Kashmir that Indian intelligence had identified as camps where anti-India militants were being trained.

Concurrently, India took an increasingly aggressive stance against Pakistan, as a result of which both nations seriously mobilised their armed and auxiliary support forces, including in J&K and along the India-Pakistan border, and war appeared to be a serious possibility. Pakistan denied any involvement in either incident, although thereafter anti-India activities by pro-Pakistan militants significantly lessened. But Pakistan was not chastened; rather, it was pressured. The international community generally, and the United States specifically, imposed strong pressure on Pakistan to end its support for terrorists and terrorist activities. An India-Pakistan war was averted and forces were stood down. Nevertheless, India-Pakistan relations remained poor until 2003.

2005: Opening the LOC to J&K-ites

A significant change to the status quo in J&K occurred in 2005. After almost 60 years of being closed, the Line of Control was opened to allow the people of J&K to cross it and meet one another. This was a significant humanitarian development, particularly for J&K-ites who lived in southern J&K. After the low point in India-Pakistan relations in 2001–02 when India and Pakistan almost went to war, relations improved reasonably rapidly. In November 2003, both nations instituted a formal ceasefire to apply to all Indian and Pakistani forces on the India-Pakistan border, the LOC, and Siachen Glacier. This worked well until late 2007, when cross-LOC military incidents and infiltrations of militants increased as India-Pakistan relations again worsened. However, in February 2004, both nations had begun serious and ongoing discussions via their Composite Dialogue about their various disputes, including over Jammu and Kashmir.

As a result of their improved relations, India and Pakistan reached a number of agreements in relation to J&K. First, in April 2005, they instituted a fortnightly bus service to allow small numbers of approved J&K State Subjects to travel between Srinagar and Muzaffarabad. J&K-ites travel along the re-opened Jhelum Valley Road that fighting had closed in 1947, but only after they have endured the one-to-three month process to obtain the requisite permissions from local administrators on each side of the LOC. Additional cross-LOC activities have since been permitted. These include: a bus service that operates between Indian J&K's Poonch City and Rawalakot in Azad Kashmir via the Poonch crossing point that opened in 2006; inter-regional trade using a difficult barter system, with the use of rupees, Indian or Pakistani, not allowed (some traders apparently use USD); and, the opening of a further three official crossing points. There are now five crossing points open in J&K (from north to south and west to east): Nauseri-Tithwal; Chakothi-Uri (popular); Haji Pir-Uri; Rawalakot-Poonch City (popular); and, Tattapani-Mendhar. These cross-LOC moves were significant, given that about 25 per cent of J&K-ites have a relative living on the other side of the LOC.⁷⁴ J&K-ites located in Ladakh and Baltistan would like similar cross-LOC arrangements to be instituted respectively between Kargil and Skardu so that people can also visit relatives and engage in trade. Like other J&K-ites, they would like to have the 'Line of Control' converted into a 'Line of Commerce'.⁷⁵ Their desire is problematic for Pakistan, which is trying to assert that Gilgit-Baltistan is not part of the Kashmir dispute. India also does not seem keen to institute such an arrangement.

In 2005, a catastrophic earthquake measuring 7.6 on the Richter scale occurred on 8 October in north-western parts of the subcontinent. It devastated large areas and killed 47,000 people in Azad Kashmir and 1,500 people in Indian J&K. In Azad Kashmir, the quake also injured 33,000 people and damaged 330,000 houses.⁷⁶ More than 500 aftershocks occurred during the week after the initial earthquake, including one shock measuring 5.0 on the Richter scale. Concurrently, problematic heavy rains and snows began to fall with the onset of winter. As a result of this earthquake and their

generally improving relations, India and Pakistan agreed to open all five LOC crossing points in 2006 in order to facilitate humanitarian efforts and people-to-people contacts. This was the first time that such major, officially sanctioned cross-LOC movement had been possible since fighting began in J&K in 1947. A certain amount of ‘coming and going’ by J&K-ites had always been ‘winked at by the authorities’ on both sides.⁷⁷ Such activities had become difficult after the 1965 India-Pakistan war, very difficult after the Kashmiris began their anti-India uprising in 1988, and virtually impossible after India thereafter fenced large parts of the LOC. One significant aspect of these cross-LOC arrangements is that the people of the disputed state of J&K now have more ways of accessing each other by land than the people of India and Pakistan, whose territories and borders are not in dispute. For many J&K-ites, the opening of these LOC crossings has been the most important and beneficial change to the status quo in J&K.

PART FIVE

RESOLVING THE KASHMIR DISPUTE

Since October 1947, there have been at least ‘48 small or broad “road-maps” given by different entities’ to try to resolve the Kashmir dispute.¹ The various leaders of India and Pakistan, or their nominated envoys and diplomatic missions, have engaged in considerable correspondence, numerous meetings and occasional negotiations. The issue is no longer which nation should obtain J&K in its entirety. Since at least 1950, India and Pakistan have been prepared to divide the former princely state between them. Indeed, posturing and public statements aside, the issue since 1950 has been how and where to divide J&K. The best attempts by India and Pakistan to resolve their dispute over J&K—or, more to the point, to determine how to permanently politically divide J&K between them—occurred in 1953, 1963, 1972, and the early 2000s. Some of these significant attempts are discussed below.

Attempts to Resolve the Kashmir dispute

As early as November 1947, leaders from India and Pakistan began discussions on how to resolve their nations’ dispute over J&K’s international status. Initially, discussions involved the Prime Minister of India, Jawaharlal Nehru, and the Prime Minister of Pakistan, Liaquat Ali Khan. This situation changed after India took the J&K issue to the UNSC in late 1947, hoping to get Pakistan’s aggression in J&K condemned. For India, this aggression comprised Pakistan’s dispatching of irregular Pukhtoon tribesmen to illegally invade and capture J&K. Instead, to India’s chagrin, the UNSC created UNCIP, which body then visited J&K in July 1948 to examine the situation there. In late 1948, the UN brokered a ceasefire between Indian and Pakistan forces. It came into effect on 1 January 1949, effectively ending the first India-Pakistan war in, and over, J&K. Thereafter, because peace had returned to J&K, many Indians, Pakistanis and J&K-ites expected that the UN-supervised plebiscite would soon be conducted so that the people of J&K could resolve their state’s international status. However, by mid-1953, it was clear to all parties that the United Nations was unable to facilitate the holding of the People’s Plebiscite. Consequently, India and Pakistan themselves engaged thereafter in bilateral discussions about how to resolve their dispute over J&K and, significantly, about how and where to divide this entity between them.

One of the first major bilateral discussions between Indian and Pakistani leaders involved Jawaharlal Nehru and Muhammad Ali Bogra. In 1953, both Prime Ministers held talks about conducting the People’s Plebiscite. Nehru was partly inspired because he was upset by Kashmiris’ severe disenchantment with India, especially that resulting from the sacking, with Indian connivance, of their popular leader, Sheikh Abdullah. The Nehru-Bogra talks failed, chiefly because Bogra, an East Pakistani, was in a weak political position in Pakistan, but also because Nehru disliked Pakistan’s entry into the Western-led Cold War alliances of SEATO and CENTO. These alliances made India feel insecure. More significantly, by the early 1950s (if not earlier), India believed that it almost certainly would ‘lose’ any plebiscite held in J&K.

From late December 1962 until May 1963, with India in a weak position after its humiliating defeat

by China in 1962, India's Railway Minister, Swaran Singh, and Pakistan's recently-appointed and brash Foreign Minister, Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, held six meetings about J&K. Despite US and UK encouragement, their talks failed. Both envoys contemplated a partition of J&K based on people's religion. Initially, their plan used the Chenab River that flows through the former undivided Jammu Province as the dividing line. However, Bhutto upped the ante and arrogantly demanded more land for Pakistan. India had been prepared to cede 1,500 sq. miles—or even 3,500 sq. miles, according to one source—of territory. Unrealistically, however, Bhutto apparently had wanted all of J&K except for the eastern Kathua District of Jammu.² A partition of J&K was not a new idea. Some Muslims had been concerned about this possibility since March 1949.³ And, while a partition of J&K may have suited India and Pakistan, it was unclear how J&K-ites felt about their state being divided.

In 1972, the situation was reversed, with Pakistan in a weak position following its devastating loss to India in the 1971 war. Bhutto was now Pakistan's President. He apparently charmed India's politically powerful, and victorious, Prime Minister, Indira Gandhi, and secured a better-than-expected peace settlement for Pakistan. This included the return of 90,000 captured Pakistanis, most of whom were security personnel. Significantly, the resultant 1972 Simla Agreement that Gandhi and Bhutto agreed made the Kashmir dispute a bilateral issue to be resolved by India and Pakistan only. There would be no third party involvement whatsoever. India has adhered to this position ever since.

The United Nations Security Council also often discussed the J&K situation—or 'The India-Pakistan question' as it called this matter—in the early years of the dispute. In 1948, it created UNCIP and tasked it to investigate the India-Pakistan dispute over J&K.⁴ In April 1948, UNSC Resolution 47 detailed the demilitarisation of J&K and reiterated that the plebiscite should be held there.⁵ Thereafter, the UN attempted to achieve both tasks. It sent three representatives to the subcontinent to negotiate the implementation of the plebiscite, or to encourage India and Pakistan to engage in negotiations to resolve the Kashmir dispute. The first UN representative was Sir Owen Dixon in 1950. He was followed by Dr Frank P. Graham from the United States (1951–53; 1957–58), and by Mr Gunnar Jarring from Sweden (1957). Despite their extensive, tortuous and best efforts, all three representatives were unsuccessful. Their efforts are reflected by the vast amount of detailed documentation generated between 1948 and 1958 during the period of active UN involvement with India and Pakistan. This documentation reveals that UN Representatives found it difficult to negotiate with both nations' frequently inflexible leaders.

After 1965, the futility of trying to discuss or influence the intractable positions of India and Pakistan on J&K led to prolonged—indeed, total—UN inaction on the Kashmir dispute. Indeed, the UNSC has not discussed J&K since the 1965 India-Pakistan war. This circumstance partly eventuated because the USSR either vetoed or threatened to veto this matter in the United Nations Security Council. Nevertheless, the UN remained involved in J&K through its small United Nations Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan (UNMOGIP) that has served in J&K since 1949. The task of UNMOGIP personnel has been to monitor and supervise military activity along the ceasefire line (LOC after 1972).⁶ While now largely ineffectual, Pakistan is very happy to have UNMOGIP in J&K. India has been reluctant, particularly since 1972 and the Simla Agreement that formally sidelined the UNSC from the Kashmir dispute. In 1971, the UNSC had discussed the India-Pakistan war in East Pakistan, but it did not specifically discuss the Kashmir dispute, although it did call for the withdrawal 'of all armed forces to their respective territories and to positions that fully respect the cease-fire' in J&K supervised by UNMOGIP.⁷ Thereafter, for India at least, the Simla Agreement has made the Kashmir dispute a bilateral issue for both it and Pakistan only to resolve. Conversely,

Pakistan later came to again consider that the United Nations could, and should, be involved in the Kashmir dispute. This was because the Simla Agreement also stated that the UN Charter and principles are to govern India-Pakistan relations.

In 1996, a major change in the UNSC's treatment of the Kashmir dispute occurred. To Islamabad's chagrin, an attempt was made to take J&K off the 'list of matters of which the Security Council is seized'. This occurred because the UNSC had not looked at this question in the previous five years. (The UNSC had not actually looked at this issue since 5 November 1965.)⁸ As far as I can determine, Islamabad must now formally and annually ask for 'The India-Pakistan question' to remain on this list.⁹ In 2010, J&K supposedly was 'removed from the United Nations list of unresolved disputes'.¹⁰ This was done inadvertently, according to Pakistan's envoy to the United Nations, which may be correct, as 'The India-Pakistan question' was still on the 2010 'list of matters of which the Security Council is seized'.¹¹ The situation is unclear.

The Official Positions of India and Pakistan

Since India and Pakistan began their dispute over J&K in 1947, India's official position has softened somewhat, while Pakistan's position has essentially remained the same, except for a change made briefly during General Musharraf's tenure as Pakistan's President. India's hardline position is that it claims all of J&K because Maharaja Hari Singh acceded to it in 1947. When in a strident or intransigent mood, the question for New Delhi is not whether Pakistan will vacate those parts of J&K that it is illegally occupying, but when. On occasions, India reiterates its position that, because the J&K ruler acceded to it in 1947, J&K is 'an integral part of India'. This is despite India having never actually controlled 'its' two supposed 'integral' regions of Azad Kashmir and the Northern Areas/Gilgit-Baltistan that, in reality, have long been under Pakistan's control. India's more realistic, less belligerent or 'softer' position is to conclude some sort of a negotiated bilateral solution with Pakistan, ostensibly based around converting the Line of Control into an international border. Since 2004, India has also sought to institute some confidence building measures (CBMs) to improve the India-Pakistan relationship in areas other than J&K. These have had minimal success.

Pakistan has long considered the Kashmir dispute to be 'the unfinished business of partition' that must be resolved before all other India-Pakistan issues can be addressed. Therefore, Pakistan has first wanted to resolve the dispute over J&K, then to improve relations with India in other areas. It is important to note that Pakistan does not actually claim J&K. Rather, Pakistan's long-held position has been that it wants the UN-supervised plebiscite conducted so that the people of J&K can decide whether their state, in its entirety, will join India or Pakistan. For Islamabad, this is an inalienable right for the people of J&K as per the United Nations Charter—although this right was never extended to dissident Bengalis before 1971, nor has Islamabad ever offered it to similarly disenchanted Balochis. Nevertheless, Pakistan's Constitution considers that, should a plebiscite be held, J&K-ites will choose to join Pakistan. According to Section 257, 'When the people of [J&K] decide to accede to Pakistan, the relationship between Pakistan and the State shall be determined in accordance with the wishes of the people of that State'.¹² Such seeming certainty of using the word 'when' rather than 'if' may be misplaced.

While Pakistan's diplomatic stance is to still call for the People's Plebiscite to be held, over time, this poll increasingly has appeared to be erroneous. India is clearly not interested in having the plebiscite conducted. During serious bilateral discussions with India about how to divide J&K, Pakistan also has clearly and effectively put the poll 'on hold', or it has even agreed that the

plebiscite should not, and will not, be held. Pakistan's desire to have the poll conducted has also often been duplicitous, given that Pakistan could not bring itself to meet the UN resolutions' requirements to withdraw its forces from J&K, to encourage other Pakistanis to leave J&K, and to allow minimal Indian forces into the areas vacated by Pakistan. Ironically, Pakistan has also, at times, called for the People's Plebiscite to be held even though Pakistan itself has been concurrently under military rule. For about half of its existence since 1947, the Pakistan military has directly, and undemocratically, ruled this nation. Similarly, India, a great democracy whose citizens regularly participate in elections, has patently and blatantly not wanted the democratic People's Plebiscite conducted. For some, India's intransigence is a blight on its otherwise excellent democratic credentials and record. Finally, some, perhaps many, J&K-ites now favour independence, which third option the UN plebiscite does not countenance.

Under General Musharraf's rule (October 1999–August 2008), Pakistan's stance on J&K softened remarkably and Islamabad appeared (excessively) keen to resolve the Kashmir dispute. Islamabad stopped insisting that India-Pakistan relations could only be normalised once their dispute over J&K was resolved. This softening was possibly to do with Musharraf's desire to go down in history as the man who solved the Kashmir dispute. Being a little more charitable, Musharraf may also have had a genuine desire to end a serious problem that was impeding Pakistan. Either way, his actions were surprising given that his constituency, the Pakistan Army, would be one 'loser' from any settlement to the Kashmir dispute as an improved India-Pakistan relationship might mean that Pakistan would then not require such a massive standing army. One catalyst for the change in India-Pakistan relations followed an important meeting between India's Prime Minister, Vajpayee, who also possibly desired being remembered for solving the Kashmir dispute, and Musharraf, on the sidelines of the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) summit meeting in Islamabad in January 2004.¹³ This followed their historic summit meeting in Agra in 2001 that ultimately ended in acrimony when they couldn't agree to include J&K in a joint declaration about bilateral issues, even though Musharraf believed he had obtained such agreement. Musharraf's anger may have inspired the terrorist attack on the Indian Parliament later that year, after which India-Pakistan acrimony exploded—figuratively, not literally, thankfully.

Seeking better relations, Vajpayee and Musharraf agreed at SAARC that an unconditional bilateral Composite Dialogue should commence in February 2004. They were inspired partly by international pressure, particularly by the United States post-9/11, and partly by the very dark period in India-Pakistan relations in 2001–02 when the nuclear-armed nations almost went to war. Other ameliorating factors included the changing nature of both nations' relations with China—with India's improving and with Pakistan no longer assured of unequivocal Chinese support on J&K—and an increasing desire in New Delhi and Islamabad for more normalcy in their affairs. Another factor was India's major need for energy, with supplies potentially available via pipelines emanating from Iran or Central Asia, both of which routes must cross Pakistan, of course. Pakistan itself had numerous political, social and economic problems, and it wanted, and needed, to reduce the amount spent directly on sustaining its military forces and, indirectly, on servicing the ongoing debt accrued arming and equipping these forces. Increasingly, Islamabad had major problems on its western side dealing with Taliban elements in the Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA). Supposedly inspired by Islam, these terrorists were preceded by other similarly conservative or regressive elements, particularly anti-Soviet *mujahideen* in the 1980s and the Taliban who ruled Afghanistan from 1996–2001. (Interestingly, in areas nearby FATA, anti-British *ghazis* (religious warriors) had operated in the late 1830s, as had anti-British 'Hindustani Fanatics' (who, despite their name, were Muslims) in

the 1890s.) Another problem for Pakistan was disgruntled Balochis in Balochistan, an issue Pakistan unrealistically has at times blamed on 'foreign hand' (meaning Indian) activity. Equally unrealistically, India has blamed the foreign hand (meaning Pakistan) for some of its problems with insurgents in north-eastern India.

The Composite Dialogue was instigated to discuss, and to try to satisfactorily resolve, all contentious India-Pakistan issues. Eight topics were agreed: 1) peace and security, including CBMs; 2) J&K; 3) Siachen Glacier; 4) Wullar Barrage/Tulbul Navigation project (by India in the Kashmir Valley); 5) Sir Creek (a disputed waterway near the Arabian Sea); 6) terrorism and drug-trafficking; 7) economic and commercial cooperation; and, 8) the promotion of friendly exchanges. Both sides gave 'ground', so to speak, to enable this dialogue to commence. India finally agreed to talk about J&K: previously, it had wanted comprehensive discussions with Pakistan about everything except J&K. Pakistan finally agreed to discuss matters other than J&K: previously, it had only wanted to discuss J&K, after which other matters could then be discussed. Their agreement to discuss these various issues may have pointed to J&K's relative decline in importance, 'not to a change of heart among the leaders of these two traditional adversaries'.¹⁴ For a range of reasons, the Kashmir dispute was not generating the passions among Indians and Pakistanis that it used to do. These reasons included a greater desire for both nations to develop economically rather than to fight wars, and the realisation that each nation's military was unable to capture or liberate all of J&K. After the Composite Dialogue began in 2004, five rounds of discussions were completed. Although no major resolutions were achieved, the discussions improved the tone and tenor of India-Pakistan relations. Indeed, the fact that these discussions occurred at all was a positive development in the fragile and often parlous India-Pakistan relationship.

Things moved even further in 2006, when Musharraf declared that he was prepared to engage in 'out of the box' thinking and countenance other possibilities in relation to resolving the Kashmir dispute.¹⁵ This change in stance partly resulted because of the negativity that Pakistan confronted about its pre- and post-9/11 role in terrorism. Cleverly, Musharraf's desired final option and bottom-line position were never fully enunciated. He also sought to further dissect J&K, particularly Indian J&K, by suggesting that, based on religion, ethnicity and geography, J&K comprised seven regions that could each have self-rule: Pakistan's two Muslim-majority regions of Azad Kashmir and the Northern Areas and India's five regions comprising Hindu-majority areas of (eastern) Jammu, Muslim-majority areas of (western) Jammu, the Muslim-majority Kashmir Valley, Shia-majority Kargil, and Buddhist Ladakh.¹⁶ Musharraf's idea suggested that he—falsely and like his political forebears—believed that each religion and religious group in each of his divisions had monolithic qualities that made them coherent and easily divisible and that, therefore, J&K should be divided along purely religious lines, not regional lines. Such a formula did not resonate with secular India. It wanted no further divisions of the subcontinent based on religion. Musharraf's idea also suggested that the most homogenous entity within J&K was Muslim-majority Kashmir Valley, which did not require dividing. For Jammuites and Ladakhis long disenchanted with Kashmiris' domination of Indian J&K, such self-rule potentially offered them refreshing liberation, although they may not have been happy to have their regions divided into smaller units solely on the basis of religion. Furthermore, had Musharraf wanted to, he could have divided the Northern Areas based on ethnicity, religion and/ or geography into its component parts of (Shia) Gilgit and (Sunni) Baltistan. Such a division may have disadvantaged Pakistan, however. Musharraf's idea appeared to be a tactic to divide politicians in India and Indian J&K.

Despite General Musharraf's attempted dissections, one thing remained clear: Islamabad would

not consider permanently dividing J&K by converting the Line of Control into an international border, which was India's preferred option. So, striving to advance the discussion, in December 2006, Musharraf proposed a four-point solution to end the Kashmir dispute: 1) no change to the current boundaries; 2) make the borders and the LOC irrelevant; 3) a staggered demilitarisation; and, 4) autonomy or self-governance with a joint supervision mechanism. Extraordinarily, according to Musharraf, if India was prepared to accept his solution, then 'Pakistan [wa]s prepared to give up its claim to Kashmir'.¹⁷ While a bold initiative, it was not clear if Musharraf's proposed autonomy and joint supervision related to all of J&K, or to the Kashmir Valley, or to some other unspecified area. Furthermore, joint supervision would have been very difficult for Indians and Pakistanis to undertake, given their inherent mistrust and almost total lack of involvement with one another since 1965. Finally, the General was displaying a military 'brook no opposition, take no prisoners' mindset. Not surprisingly, India did not rush to agree to anything, even though Musharraf's dominating political and military leadership of Pakistan provided New Delhi with a significant opportunity to resolve the Kashmir dispute. Furthermore, by June 2001, Musharraf was President of Pakistan. In 2002, he instituted a 'command democracy' (my term) to have civilian politicians elected who could, and would, ratify his military rule and do his bidding. Seemingly, this meant that Musharraf could have imposed his solution on Pakistanis—and on those J&K-ites under Pakistan's control.

Conversely, India's Prime Minister, Dr Manmohan Singh, was in a politically weak situation. He was the leader of the largest party, Congress, in the multi-party United Progressive Alliance coalition of centre-left parties. He could not, however, guarantee that the Indian Parliament would back any resolution that he might propose on such an emotive and divisive issue that, most significantly, could easily be politicised. Additionally, India was in no hurry. Pakistan was the (frustrated) revisionist nation that wanted things to change re J&K. India was the (obdurate) status quo power that neither needed the situation to alter, nor needed to succumb to Musharraf's desire to conclude a quick settlement, largely on his terms, to the longstanding problem. Apparently, both sides got very close to a solution. According to a high-level personal source, only the Ts needed to be crossed and the Is dotted in the final written agreement, after which formal invitations to a resolution function involving both leaders were to be issued. Indeed, in retrospect, India may have lost an opportunity to resolve the Kashmir dispute on terms much to Indians' liking. Musharraf's premature—for India, at least—political demise in 2008 prevented this. Equally, neither leader had taken their political parliamentary colleagues into their confidence, which was problematic for Singh, given his weak political position. Nor was it certain that both leaders could 'sell' any solution to their domestic constituencies typically raised on a dysfunctional diet of disdain for the other, as well as distanced relations. Even more problematic may have been selling their resolution to the people of J&K on whom it would essentially be imposed. Both leaders had neither directly informed, nor consulted, in any meaningful way either of these parties about their possible solution to the Kashmir dispute.

On 26 November 2008, India suspended the Composite Dialogue after terrorists brutally attacked Mumbai. This attack, which Indians call '26/11', was the final straw for New Delhi. India (correctly) blamed Pakistanis for the outrage, particularly the 'fundamentalist' Lashkar-e-Taiba based in (Pakistani) Punjab, that also operated in J&K. Pakistan wanted the dialogue to resume, but the Congress-led coalition government re-elected in May 2009 wanted guarantees from a reluctant Pakistan that it would not harbour or support terrorists. Equally, New Delhi was in no hurry to resume talks. There was still significant anger in India with Pakistan, with many Indians wanting India to militarily strike its neighbour. Aided by some international pressure against Pakistan, Dr Singh chose restraint, with India responding diplomatically. He also was possibly restrained because the

Indian Air Force lacked a suitable or sufficient strike capability. Additionally, with India's economy growing and with Pakistan's economy in trouble, there was little incentive for India to address their mutual issues. Finally, as the status quo power, there was no need for India to attempt to resolve the Kashmir dispute, even though young Kashmiris in 2010 were displaying severe disgruntlement with India by engaging in protests and numerous stone throwing incidents. The Kashmiris organised these protests using social media, chiefly SMS messaging, which was a new factor for Indian paramilitary forces and police to deal with.

In 2011, India and Pakistan started talking about the possibility of resuming the Composite Dialogue, although India had become unhappy with this term and it wanted some topics added, such as Afghanistan. Since then, discussions have been piecemeal at best. In April 2011, a process that Islamabad calls the 'Resumed Composite Dialogue' and New Delhi calls the 'Comprehensive Dialogue' started. It has lacked the coherence, urgency and media attention of previous talks and very little has yet been achieved. Like all India-Pakistan activities, this process is subjected to being hijacked by unexpected events. Early in 2013, for example, some nasty cross-LOC incidents occurred in J&K, with one resulting in the beheading of an Indian soldier. As with almost all cross-LOC events, it is impossible to determine what actually happened, who was responsible for the incident, and why it occurred. In February 2013, India suddenly hanged Afzul Guru, a Kashmiri convicted of masterminding the 2001 attack on the Indian Parliament. Many Kashmiris were outraged by Afzul's execution, particularly as his family was not informed beforehand of his impending death. The Pakistan Parliament condemned the hanging, with the Minister for Kashmir Affairs and Gilgit-Baltistan later calling on Pakistan to take India to the International Criminal Court because Guru had not received a fair trial. In February 2014, cross-LOC trade was suspended for over five weeks when authorities in Indian J&K arrested a truck driver from the 'other side' for allegedly smuggling drugs. Responding in a similar way, authorities in Azad Kashmir detained some truck drivers from Indian J&K. Negotiations eventually resolved the issue. In August 2014, India cancelled planned talks between the Foreign Secretaries of India and Pakistan after the Pakistan High Commissioner in New Delhi 'interfered in India's internal affairs' by talking to some Hurriyat Conference leaders from Kashmir. Under previous Indian governments, similar meetings had not been a major issue. This cancellation followed a promising improvement in India-Pakistan relations after Pakistan's Prime Minister, Nawaz Sharif, attended the inauguration of India's new Prime Minister, Narendra Modi, in New Delhi in May 2014.

The India-Pakistan 'trust deficit'

India and Pakistan 'enjoy' a predicable, but parlous, relationship. It is fractious, with J&K often at the centre of it. Governments in India and Pakistan face a huge task to resolve the Kashmir dispute. They must overcome the insidious and persistent trust deficit that saturates the psyches and perceptions of many Indians and Pakistanis, both officials and ordinary citizens. Events in 1947, including in J&K, instigated this trust deficit; differing and irreconcilable ideas of nationhood and intrigue have fed it; wars, rivalry and inimical 'foreign hand' activities against the 'other', including in J&K, have furthered it. One result is that there is a significant, ongoing lack of contact between the two nations and their peoples. This is despite their vast array of similarities: shared geography, history, ethnicity, languages, culture, food and religions, with India having a similar number of Muslims to Pakistan.

A number of events have entrenched mutual India-Pakistan mistrust. Many of these have involved

J&K. For Indians, perceived or actual factors that have led to their mistrust of Pakistan and/ or of Pakistanis include:

- the Pakistan Government's support for local anti-Maharaja insurgents in J&K after August 1947 and Pakistan's instigation of the Pukhtoons' brutal invasion of Kashmir Province on 22 October 1947 in order to capture J&K;
- Karachi's late admission in July 1948 about the official entry of the Pakistan Army into J&K in May 1948;
- Pakistan's utter reluctance to withdraw its military forces from J&K, to use its 'best endeavours' to get other Pakistanis to leave J&K, and to allow minimal Indian forces into the vacated areas, as UN resolutions relating to the People's Plebiscite required;
- Pakistan's membership of the Western-led security alliances, SEATO and CENTO, which suggested to New Delhi that Pakistan might try to capture J&K using military means;
- Pakistan forces skirmishing with Indian forces in the Rann of Kutch in April 1965 in which Pakistan's forces did better and after which India, as a result of arbitration, ultimately lost ten per cent of this area;
- after the Rann of Kutch incident, a 'cocky, even truculent' Pakistan Army organising and infiltrating undercover saboteurs into J&K in July–August 1965 to foment an anti-India rebellion in Indian J&K (Operation Gibraltar),¹⁸ after which the Pakistan Army entered Indian J&K in August–September 1965 (Operation Grandslam), the result of which was the 1965 India-Pakistan war;
- Pakistan's support for pro-independence Sikhs pursuing an independent 'Khalistan' in the 1980s;
- Pakistan deploying patrols around the Siachen Glacier area in the early 1980s in an area of north-eastern J&K where the LOC was never demarcated;
- since 1988, Pakistan's ongoing sponsorship, training, arming, support and provision of sanctuary for anti-India militants fighting Indian paramilitary forces in the Kashmir Valley in what some Indians consider to be a proxy war for Pakistan;
- the Kargil War in 1999, in which Pakistan used the Northern Light Infantry, disguised as militants, to seize Indian positions on the LOC, with Indian forces then having to fight against these entrenched forces to recapture Indian positions;
- the terrorist incident against the Indian Parliament in December 2001 by groups based in Pakistan who had been trained and/ or supported by Pakistan's ISI;
- similarly, the terrorist attacks against Mumbai from 26–29 November 2008, which India considered were initiated from Pakistan by Pakistanis (as Pakistan's then Interior Minister, Rehman Malik, later publicly admitted).¹⁹

For Pakistanis, perceived or actual factors that have led to their mistrust of India and/or of Indians include:

- India, from the outset, never accepting the existence of Pakistan and that India wants to destroy and/ or re-integrate Pakistan;
- Nehru and others manipulating the British Viceroy, Mountbatten, before partition, causing the Muslim League to obtain, as Jinnah called it, a 'moth-eaten' Pakistan after partition that was devoid of some significant areas, such as Calcutta and eastern Punjab, that had been part of the Muslim-majority, British-administered provinces of Bengal and Punjab that the British

- partitioned;
- similarly, in August 1947, Nehru pressuring Mountbatten, who, in turn, ‘influenced’ the Boundary Commissioner, Radcliffe, to grant India the important Gurdaspur corridor that joined far eastern J&K to the (eastern) Indian portion of partitioned Punjab;
- India obtaining Maharaja Hari Singh’s accession in 1947 by guile and by manipulating him, including ‘encouraging’ the ruler to appoint a pro-India J&K Prime Minister just before his accession, to free pro-India politicians from jail in J&K, especially the popular and influential Sheikh Abdullah, while keeping pro-Pakistan politicians incarcerated, and to censor, close or harass pro-Pakistan publications and journalists, while not allowing pro-Pakistan politicians and leaders to enter the princely state;
- India never allowing the People’s Plebiscite to be held, even though India initiated this proposal and the United Nations endorsed it;
- India playing a substantial part in the Bengalis’ insurgency in East Pakistan, then the third India-Pakistan war in 1971, the result of which was the dismemberment of Pakistan and the creation of Bangladesh;
- India testing its first nuclear weapon in 1974 at a time when Pakistan was weak after its defeat in the 1971 India-Pakistan war;
- India deploying troops to Siachen Glacier in the early 1980s in an area of north-eastern J&K where the LOC was never demarcated;
- the Indian Army provocatively staging the ‘Operation Brasstacks’ exercise in 1986–87, during which a large segment of the Indian military engaged in a massive mobilisation near the Pakistan border that Pakistan found threatening;
- India’s consistent support for anti-social elements in Pakistan, most recently disgruntled Balochis in south-western Pakistan;
- India’s ongoing involvement in Afghanistan, where Pakistan is concerned that Indian activities could weaken Pakistan, or that a pro-Indian Afghanistan regime might allow India to outflank Pakistan there.

One direct result of the India-Pakistan trust deficit is that Indians and Pakistanis have limited and difficult ways of accessing each other. There are only one land and two rail border crossings in existence, while air or sea travel between India and Pakistan is limited. Another result is that India and Pakistan share little trade, with direct two-way trade currently worth only USD 2.5 billion. This could increase greatly if Pakistan were to grant India ‘Most Favoured Nation’ (MFN) status, as India granted to Pakistan in 1996. The Pakistan Government has been unable to reciprocate because many Pakistanis consider (incorrectly) that this term suggests that India will receive special treatment from Pakistan. It won’t; all that MFN does is to normalise trade between two nations. Islamabad’s reluctance to increase trade with India has partly been because the ‘core issue of Kashmir’ has not been resolved.

Another result of the India-Pakistan trust deficit is that certain influential bodies in India and, even more so, in Pakistan have a vested interest to ensure that India-Pakistan relations remain poor and that mistrust of the other continues. Right-wing Indian elements would find it more difficult to readily criticise Pakistan if India-Pakistan relations were better. In Pakistan, the Pakistan Army knows that good India-Pakistan relations would obviate Pakistan’s need for such a large military force. Downsizing this force could mean a loss of prestige, capability, influence and economic power for military members, past and present, plus, it might impair the military’s ability to successfully mount

coups. Equally, public statements by the influential, but usually apolitical, Indian Army reveal one of its vested interests: Indian generals are highly reluctant to leave Siachen Glacier because they fear that Pakistani forces will seize the Indian Army's hard-won positions there. In terms of the trust deficit, Siachen Glacier is the 'litmus test' in India-Pakistan relations. If both nations can resolve this difficult issue of trust, then all other (relatively less difficult) issues can be resolved.

Another result of the trust deficit is that both nations, and their populations, lack a compelling desire, or need, to resolve the Kashmir dispute. Because the other nation fundamentally can't be trusted, there is little official commitment or drive on both 'sides' to resolve this long-standing issue. Indeed, there is often a greater need to apportion blame for past, or current, misdeeds, perceived or actual. There also is a significant lack of popular pressure to propel, prod or provoke politicians to resolve the Kashmir dispute. This is possibly because most Indians and Pakistanis are remote from J&K. The Kashmir dispute is therefore 'out of sight' and 'out of mind' and not a matter of 'life or death' that demands resolution. However, Indians and Pakistanis forget that the India-Pakistan struggle over J&K impacts on all of them indirectly, if only because scarce national assets are used daily to sustain massive military forces deployed throughout J&K. This includes via the inhospitable—and costly—campaign on Siachen Glacier and the stationing of troops along the LOC all year round.

The final result of the India-Pakistan trust deficit is that the lack of trust of the 'other' provides Indian and Pakistani politicians with a convenient device to blame the 'foreign hand' for some of their own nation's problems. Hence, India accuses Pakistan of meddling in the Kashmir Valley, which Pakistan certainly does, and in India's remote north-east, where Pakistani involvement is unlikely. Similarly, Pakistan has blamed India for fuelling problems in disenchanted Balochistan, which is likely, and in the Taliban-rampant Federally Administered Tribal Areas, which seems unlikely. The overall result of the India-Pakistan trust deficit is that the Kashmir dispute remains unresolved.

There are other reasons for this failure. First and foremost, there has never been the right leader at the right time in both nations who has possessed the vision and political 'clout' to determine, then enforce, a solution. Leaders in both nations also have lacked political constituencies 'breathing down their necks' compelling them to resolve the Kashmir dispute. This matter does not endanger most Indians or Pakistanis physically, economically or directly. Furthermore, since 1947, both nations have functioned reasonably well, despite their ongoing dispute over J&K. Both nations also have never needed to greatly consider the wishes or aspirations of the divided people of J&K who, partly because of the physical and militarily division imposed on them, are politically impotent and largely insignificant. Additionally, no external third party or powerful external lobby offers J&K-ites any support to oppose India and Pakistan, politically or militarily, or to compel both nations to come to the negotiating table in the way that the Vietnamese, for example, supported by China and the USSR, successfully opposed the US. A further factor is that some vested and entrenched interests that stand to lose should the J&K issue ever be resolved may not actually favour a resolution. The Pakistan military is one such vested interest; local politicians in J&K may be another. Internationally, there has been no significant and sustained pressure to resolve the Kashmir dispute, probably because no nations have any vital or strategic interests in J&K that need protecting or because J&K itself does not have any valuable resources, such as oil, that require the Kashmir dispute to be resolved in order that these could be exploited. J&K-ites themselves also are not high profile: they are not starving or being starved in droves; they are not being slaughtered, tortured and imprisoned in large numbers by brutal dictators or by nasty metropolitan powers (although Kashmiris would argue otherwise re India, as has Pakistan, at times); they are not perishing daily in massive outbreaks of disease. Similarly,

J&K-ites are not 'sexy' for the media in the way that, say, Israel is for US media outlets or the Tibetan cause is for Westerners. The people of J&K and their homelands are far less significant.

Common sense or reasonableness suggests that India, Pakistan and the people of J&K would all benefit from the Kashmir dispute being resolved. However, until this issue becomes a compelling or urgent one for both nations, or until there is sustained and significant domestic pressure on the governments of India and Pakistan, or if international pressure becomes intense because India and Pakistan look like they will engage in a conventional and/ or nuclear war in or over J&K, a resolution to the Kashmir dispute is unlikely. It is just not that important domestically or internationally. Should India become so economically powerful and attractive or should Pakistan become a diabolical 'basket case', people in J&K might 'vote with their feet' and move or lobby strongly for J&K to join India. The arrival of popular, visionary and, most importantly, unassailably powerful political leaders in India and Pakistan might mean that they together could resolve the Kashmir dispute. Problematically, such leaders can neither be manufactured nor created. Such statesmen would also need to emerge in India and Pakistan simultaneously and, concurrently, have the same aspirations, generosity of spirit and political power. Given the 'baggage' of Indians and Pakistanis detailed above, this is unlikely to happen. A younger generation of leaders devoid of such baggage may be needed in order to resolve the Kashmir dispute.

It is worth noting that, should the leaders of India and Pakistan ever resolve their dispute over J&K, there is no guarantee that this would automatically improve India-Pakistan relations. There is deep antipathy, strong rivalry and abiding mistrust between both nations and their peoples, plus many other problems for them to resolve. One of the most serious problems concerns water. This necessarily will involve J&K, through which flow three of the six rivers in the Indus system. Additionally, depending on the details of any resolution, India or Pakistan might need to discuss with China the territory of Aksai Chin that China holds and which India considers to be part of J&K.

Since 1947: an increasing desire for independence

An apparent major change in relation to resolving the Kashmir dispute concerns J&K-ites' political aspirations: many now have an increased desire for independence. This suggests that the People's Plebiscite with its two options only of J&K joining India or Pakistan is no longer valid. I have used the term 'apparent major change' as it is impossible to confirm this perception. It has always been difficult to estimate with any degree of certainty what political desires J&K-ites have harboured for the international status of their state. In 1947, no one surveyed them about their post-British desires for J&K's international status. Since then, no one has asked them in any inclusive or meaningful way about this matter. Only in 2009 was a first ever, credible, wide-ranging survey conducted of J&K-ites and their desires for J&K's status. Using face-to-face interviews conducted in 'Dogri, Urdu, Koshur (Kashmiri) and Hindi', this survey tried to determine 'current attitudes in Kashmir [sic] on both sides of the LoC [sic] to alternative scenarios for the resolution of the [Kashmir] conflict'.²⁰ The area surveyed comprised a truncated J&K that included Jammu, Ladakh, most of Kashmir, and most of Azad Kashmir. It excluded, without explaining why, the Indian J&K districts of Doda, Kupwara and 'Pulwara' (Pulwama), the Azad Kashmir district of Neelum, and the entire Gilgit-Baltistan region. This possibly was to do with these areas' remoteness in all cases except 'Pulwara'. Further shortcomings were that the sample group was small, only 30 per cent of Azad Kashmiri respondents were women, and most respondents lived in urban areas. Nevertheless, given the paucity of information available on the perceptions of J&K-ites and the difficulties involved in surveying them,

the survey was a significant achievement.

The results of this opinion poll were interesting. Of the 1,400 Azad Kashmiris surveyed, 44 per cent favoured independence for J&K. In Azad Kashmir's Poonch District, where the pro-Pakistan, anti-Maharaja uprising began in 1947, the percentage favouring 'independence for the whole of Kashmir [sic]', that is J&K, was a surprising 58 per cent. Equally, this sentiment may be explicable because Poonchis have not always been happy with Pakistan: for example, in the 1950s, they staged two serious uprisings in Poonch. In Indian J&K, 43 per cent of the 2,374 people surveyed favoured independence. In Ladakh, 30 per cent of people in Leh District and 20 per cent of people in Kargil District favoured independence. In the Kashmir Valley's (disenchanted) districts, the percentages of people favouring independence, not surprisingly, were high: Anantnag, 74 per cent; Badgam, 75 per cent; Baramulla, 95 per cent; Srinagar, 82 per cent. Conversely, there was zero support for independence in all Jammu districts except for Jammu, where support was a miniscule one per cent. Most Jammuites either wanted J&K to join India, particularly those in districts located in central or eastern Jammu (Jammu, Kathua, Udhampur), or to convert the LOC into the permanent international border, especially those in districts of western Jammu (Poonch and Rajauri).²¹ These results were confirmed to some extent by another less inclusive poll that asked broader questions of people about options for J&K's status. It was conducted in 2008 in 'Indian administered Kashmir (IaK)' and in 2009 in 'Pakistan administered Kashmir (PaK)'. Of people polled in this second survey, 32 per cent in IaK found 'Full Independence' for J&K 'unacceptable' (which possibly means that 68 per cent found it acceptable), while the figure in PaK was six per cent (which possibly means that 94 per cent found full independence for J&K acceptable).²² These two surveys 'support the already widespread view that the plebiscite options are likely to offer no solution to the [Kashmir] dispute'.²³

Each poll confirmed that J&K-ites' support for independence for J&K is high. For some J&K-ites, an independent J&K is a feasible and desirable possibility, particularly for members of the Jammu Kashmir Liberation Front, who may have much (unquantifiable) support in Kashmir and Azad Kashmir. A reunified and independent J&K would comprise 84,471 sq. miles or 218,800 sq. km.²⁴ This would make it around the 85th largest 'nation-state' in the world. In South Asia, it would be larger in area than the nations of Bangladesh, Bhutan, the Maldives, Nepal and Sri Lanka. It would be more populous than Bhutan and the Maldives. In terms of other J&K-ites' aspirations, many Kashmiris seemingly favour independence only for the Kashmir Valley. An independence movement seeking to establish Balawaristan also now exists in Gilgit-Baltistan. It would be a challenging proposition for an independent Kashmir or an independent Balawaristan to survive and thrive, as Bhutan and Nepal can testify. Each new nation would be small—respectively approximately 15,000 sq. km or 65,500 sq. km in area—landlocked, and with few resources. Nevertheless, some J&K-ites have been inspired by the United Nations-sponsored referendum in 1999 that enabled East Timorise to vote for independence from Indonesia. For J&K-ites, this reminded them of the long promised People's Plebiscite. However, the East Timorese referendum was actually suggested by the controlling power, Indonesia, and it had significant international support. This included from neighbouring Australia. It, along with the UN, a cooperative Indonesia (that possibly didn't believe that the Timorese would actually vote to secede) and some significant support from the United States, played a major part in stabilising and supporting the new nation of Timor Leste. J&K-ites do not have such support for any similar plebiscite, except from Pakistan. This nation, however, is impotent in enabling this option to be implemented.

In relation to independence for J&K, or any part of it, this third option will be exceedingly difficult

for J&K-ites to achieve. There is one very simple, but compelling, reason for this: the only point that I have ever found about which India and Pakistan agree in their entire dispute over which nation should possess J&K is that neither J&K, nor any part of it, can become independent. Possibly, leaders in both nations fear that, if they grant independence to one disgruntled part of their nation, the nation itself could unravel politically. Such rare agreement between India and Pakistan is possibly shortsighted: a 'lose-lose' situation in which both 'lose' control of the Kashmir Valley, potential (for Pakistan) or actual (for India), to Kashmiris—not to their opponent—might be sufficient to resolve their territorial dispute over J&K. In other words, neither nation gets to possess, or control, the prize in J&K: Kashmir. Another possibility would be to grant Kashmir maximum autonomy, with both nations guaranteeing Kashmir's security. This region could then become a bridge between India and Pakistan, rather than a huge obstacle. Such India-Pakistan unanimity on the issue of J&K not being allowed independence offers J&K-ites little hope or encouragement to pursue *azadi*. They also have no international supporters who they can call on. Indeed, the world seems disinterested in the entire Kashmir dispute. Nations may re-engage with it should severe instability, or the export of terrorism, or the possibility of another India-Pakistan war that could go nuclear, re-appear in South Asia. Otherwise, India and Pakistan will continue to function, and the world will allow them to continue to function, without resolving their dispute over J&K.

A further variable in relation to J&K involves what happens in Afghanistan after international forces eventually withdraw from this often unruly nation. Some analysts consider that Taliban-type elements may then head to J&K to 'liberate' Muslims there, particularly those located in the Kashmir Valley under 'Hindu' India's yoke. This is a feasible concern, given that Pukhtoons invaded Kashmir in 1947 and given that some former *mujahideen* helped militants fight 'Hindu' India after 1988. (Kashmiris with long memories recall that Durranis from Afghanistan captured Kashmir in 1752.) Should such Taliban elements succeed, however, they would not deliver independence to Kashmir. Rather, they would either tie this region to Pakistan, or possibly Afghanistan, or they would impose a different, almost certainly more brutal, type of overlordship on Kashmiris. First of all, these Taliban elements must capture and control either Pakistan and/ or Afghanistan before they will have any spare capacity to look to issues and places elsewhere. Of more concern in the short term may be Taliban-type elements located in southern Punjab, such as Lashkar-e-Taiba.

One way to resolve the Kashmir dispute: Let the People Decide

In the sixty-seven years of the India-Pakistan dispute over J&K, the 'third party' to the Kashmir dispute—the people of Jammu and Kashmir—has never been consulted in any meaningful or inclusive way on how the dispute over J&K should be resolved. This ignores the fact that J&K-ites are actually the 'first party' to the Kashmir dispute simply because this dispute is about both their state and their homelands. Indeed, J&K-ites are actually the first party to this dispute because they instigated the fight over J&K's status in 1947 *before* the Maharaja's accession to India in 1947. This involved three actions: the Poonch uprising by pro-Pakistan Muslims against the Maharaja that began soon after 15 August 1947; the almost concurrent inter-religious violence in Jammu Province between pro-Pakistan Muslims and pro-India Hindus and Sikhs; and, the creation of (pro-Pakistan) Azad Kashmir on 24 October 1947. Equally, other J&K-ites also showed that they wanted to be involved in determining the future of their state. Soon after pro-Pakistan Pukhtoon tribesmen invaded Kashmir Province on 22 October 1947, Kashmiris, who were then undecided about what status they wanted for J&K, created a People's Militia to defend themselves against the Pukhtoons. In early November 1947, pro-Pakistan

Muslims staged the Gilgit uprising, with their clear intention being that their region join Pakistan. During 1947–48, pro-Pakistan Azad Kashmiris, Gilgitis and Baltis fought Indian forces in J&K while, conversely, pro-India Jammuites and Ladakhis were very supportive of the opposing Indian forces. Hence, before the 1949 ceasefire, most J&K-ites possessed a very strong notion about which nation they wanted J&K to unite with—and often were prepared to fight to try and bring their desire to fruition. This stridency suggests two things. First, that the people of J&K have strong desires about their homelands joining either India or Pakistan. Second, that without their involvement, any resolution to the Kashmir dispute determined by India and Pakistan may not be implementable. For this reason alone, J&K-ites need to be considered and consulted on how to resolve the Kashmir dispute.

Nevertheless, since 1947, J&K-ites have never been asked what international status they would like for their state. They also have been subjected to ongoing hardships and sufferings that the average Indian and Pakistani either doesn't know, or possibly doesn't care, about. These include: severe dislocation by the heavily-militarised ceasefire line/LOC that dissects most of J&K and makes meetings and mourning of the dead impossible for relatives and friends; the ongoing presence of large, heavily-armed militaries and the associated disruptions caused by these forces as they mount operations, are re-supplied, or move along narrow roads and highways; heavy and often arbitrary exchanges of small arms and artillery fire across the ceasefire line/LOC; India-Pakistan wars in 1948, 1965, 1971 and 1999 (Kargil); the loss of access to traditional, shorter and/ or more convenient, trade and transport links within J&K and to the subcontinent, particularly the Jhelum Valley Road; and, terrorism, chiefly in the Kashmir Valley. Some J&K-ites also have endured having an unresolved international status, chiefly people in Pakistan-Administered J&K, with Azad Kashmiris and GBians essentially stateless because the dispute over J&K's international status remains unresolved. For many J&K-ites, the long-running Kashmir dispute has been brutal and they have borne the brunt of this brutality. Although most simply, and stoically, get on with living their lives, they nevertheless would benefit by having this dispute resolved.

History tells us that India and Pakistan have not resolved their dispute over J&K. Short of a significant event that encourages or compels both nations to conciliate and/ or cooperate, such as an attack by a third party against both of them or a devastating natural catastrophe that impacts severely on both, the Kashmir dispute is likely to continue for some time. It doesn't have to. One way for India and Pakistan to resolve this matter would be to mutually agree to devolve it to the people of J&K and allow them to discuss, debate and determine what solution or solutions they want for what are, after all, their (disputed) lands. Such a devolution would be possible under Section 1.ii of the Simla Agreement. It states that India and Pakistan can 'settle their differences ... through bilateral negotiations or by any other peaceful means mutually agreed upon'.²⁵ Both nations therefore could agree to devolve the resolution of the Kashmir dispute to J&K-ites. I call this approach 'Let the People Decide'.²⁶ The concept comes from a speech with this title made by Jawaharlal Nehru in August 1952 in which he suggested that regarding 'the people of Jammu and Kashmir ... we will give them a chance to decide. We propose to stand by their decision in this matter.'²⁷ For this approach to occur, India and Pakistan would need to significantly change their attitudes to allow J&K-ites to be involved in resolving the Kashmir dispute. For it to proceed, India and Pakistan would need to allow and enable J&K-ites to meet regularly over a considerable period of time, including by crossing the LOC and meeting in different places throughout J&K. For it to succeed, India and Pakistan would need to accept the status or statuses that the people of J&K may decide for their lands. Both nations cannot resolve the Kashmir dispute themselves. Perhaps, J&K-ites can.

CONCLUSION

History is never static and circumstances can change very quickly. No one can absolutely predict when, how and for what reason changes will happen—but they do, and they will, including in the subcontinent. The Sikh Empire rapidly disintegrated after Ranjit Singh's death in 1839, helped by the strong and self-interested Jammuite, Gulab Singh, who was an extraordinary Indian, despite his alleged perfidy—that the British were happy to utilise to their advantage. I have enjoyed discovering his colourful past. The 'Great Game' came and went, with few recognising its actual instigation, players and demise, or that, supposedly, it was a pastime rather than serious imperial strategic rivalry. The princely state of J&K was created in 1846, consolidated thereafter, then militarily coddled until 1947. It then fragmented rapidly after the autocratic Dogras' chief supporter, the British, departed the Indian subcontinent. While the departure of the British was expected after World War II, the aloof Maharaja Hari Singh did not really engage with this eventuality until around mid-1947. By 1947, the Russian Empire, long the strategic bane of the British, had been 'dead' for thirty years, although its demise did not liberate the British strategically. From the 1910s, they confronted new strategic challenges: the rise of aggressive nations such as Germany, the USSR and Japan; seeing their status as the world's leading power slowly diminished as the increasingly powerful, but (then) strategically ambivalent, United States came to the fore; and, dealing with the popular and increasingly potent Indian independence movement. By 1947, despite having been on the winning side in World War II, the strategically weakened and emotionally tired British were more than ready to quit India—quickly. Indisputably, it was time for the Indians to rule themselves, although, to their detriment, India's politicians could not agree on how that should occur. Thus were born post-British India and Pakistan, with its two wings.

Looking more contemporaneously, we still have change. In the early 1990s, the Soviet Union quickly and fairly unexpectedly disintegrated, as did Yugoslavia. Both disintegrations happened soon after (but not because) Kashmiris instigated their anti-India uprising in 1988, a seemingly spontaneous and serious action that caught many observers by surprise. Conversely, J&K's neighbour and, according to India, the occupier of territory in disputed J&K, China, is rising again and, in the process, making Pakistanis feel good and Indians nervous. Equally, some Chinese are worried about Pakistan's current instability and they dislike the support given by Pakistanis to Uighur 'terrorists'. Meanwhile Iran, a former imperial power that once heavily influenced Kashmir culturally and socially, struggles and is unpopular internationally. Neighbouring Afghanistan, with which Kashmiris have some shared history, is soon to find itself free from external forces yet again. Nevertheless, it confronts an unstable future, as directly does its nervous neighbour, Pakistan, and as vicariously does the greater region. Beyond South Asia, East Timor obtained its independence from Indonesia in 2002 via a United Nations-supervised referendum held in 1999. This has inspired some J&K-ites, particularly Kashmiris, who want the same liberating event to happen to them and their region.

Nothing stays the same forever—and a politico-strategic analyst's job is to ponder such possibilities. Strategic pondering invariably involves speculation, albeit based on understanding, observing historical trends, considering other relevant information and bearing in mind the maxim that 'the only thing certain is uncertainty'. In relation to South Asia, history suggests that the nations of India and Pakistan that we currently know are bound to change—as has already happened since 1947.

Since 15 August 1947, the Indian Union generally has expanded. In October 1947, India ‘incorporated’ J&K into its polity—legally, but not totally—following the maharaja’s accession. In 1948, India merged Junagadh and Hyderabad, after which followed Pondicherry and French India in 1954, Goa and Portuguese India in 1961, and, finally, Sikkim in 1973. Indian ‘losses’ comprise those parts of J&K ‘held’ by Pakistan and China, other parts along the China-India border held by China, and ten per cent of the Rann of Kutch that India lost in 1968 to Pakistan. These first two losses could be formalised in the future should—or is it, when?—New Delhi and Islamabad finally agree the India-Pakistan border in J&K and Beijing and New Delhi finally agree the China-India border. Conversely, Pakistan has contracted since 1947, although initially it expanded. In 1947, Pakistan ‘won’ Azad Kashmir and the Gilgit and Baltistan regions in J&K; in 1948, it finally incorporated Kalat and the remaining princely states located wholly within Pakistan; in 1958, it purchased the Gwadar enclave from Oman; in 1968, it obtained ten per cent of the Rann of Kutch from India. Conversely, Pakistan severely constricted in 1971 when it ‘lost’ the eastern wing of East Pakistan/Bangladesh. This major territorial ‘loss’ confirmed that Islam is not a monolith, a thought that may inspire hope in Pakistanis fighting for independence or nervousness for those opposing them. Even J&K has apparently expanded in area since 1947. In 1951, Azad Kashmir was officially 4,494 sq. miles.¹ Official publications now give the region’s area as 5,134 sq. miles.² This inexplicable additional 640 sq. miles is a 14 per cent increase in Azad Kashmir’s area.

Peering into the future, any change in the subcontinent is likely to involve physical and political expansion—or contraction. One possibility, albeit remote, is the development of a South Asian federation comprising some or all of the SAARC nations. Such an entity might include J&K as a separate, possibly autonomous, or even independent, entity. Any such arrangement could resolve the issue of J&K’s international status. Equally, some South Asian nations may fragment and disappear, or they might morph into new nations. The international trend since the 1990s suggests that the latter is more likely. Some analysts posit that Pakistan could contract further. One possibility is the loss of Balochistan, Pakistan’s largest and most resource-rich province where some Balochis have been disenchanted with Pakistan on and off since 1948. Given the serious political, social, economic and religious problems that Pakistan is currently confronting, anything is possible for this entity still struggling to finally determine its identity and firmly cement its polity. However, India also will confront challenges. The uneven nature of its social and economic development might eventually prompt India’s richer states in its south and west to seek to separate from those northern, backward, heavily-populated, sluggish ‘cow belt’ states that the richer states have long financially subsidised. Equally, the ongoing Maoist social and economic movement in India’s eastern peninsular area—the Maoists want to eventually rule all of India—poses many challenges, including exploitation, social divisions and uneven development. Regionally, a possibility is that a larger nation could subsume Bhutan or the Maldives, particularly the latter, as its population strives to deal with rising sea levels. One thing seems certain: population growth and increasing water issues will plague the subcontinent in the years to come, with many people confronting difficult circumstances, and with some moving to other locations, or nations, to avoid or deal with these.

Contemplating the future of Jammu and Kashmir, one must remember that the various parts that comprise this constructed—and now long-divided—entity have enjoyed various, and varying, fates since primordial times. No doubt they will continue to do so. Before 1947, while Kashmir was J&K’s best known region, Jammu was actually J&K’s most populous and most influential province, if only because the ruler came from it. This all changed in 1947—quickly and dramatically. After the British withdrawal from the Indian subcontinent, few J&K-ites envisaged that the princely state

would quickly cease to exist as a functioning entity after 101 years. Few also considered that India and Pakistan would engage in a dispute over this divided, imagined, but almost certainly never likely to be reunified, entity for (at least) the next sixty-seven years. Similarly, few Kashmiris then pondered that some of them in the 1980s would fight a bitter and brutal insurgency against India for over twenty years to try to obtain *azadi* for their region or for it to join Pakistan. Few Kashmiris also would have envisaged that almost all of their Hindu Pandit brethren would flee Kashmir after 1988 for Jammu or parts of India and that, as a result of their insurgency, many Kashmiris would favour independence from both nations that covet their lands. In 1947, few would have pondered that India and China would fight a major war in 1962 and that, soon after, China and Pakistan would become 'all-weather friends', to India's disadvantage. Equally, there is nothing to say that, in the future, India and China might agree to become strategic allies and pragmatically divide Asia between them. Although this is currently unlikely, such a union would offer serious challenges to Western strategic planners and to other Asians, particularly if Russia was to join and make this twosome a threesome. While unlikely, it certainly is possible.

It also is possible that the Kashmir dispute won't be resolved for another sixty-seven years. Things may improve once members of the generation that experienced partition and the 1962 China-India war depart their 'mortal coils', but there is no guarantee. Then again, given the right circumstances and leadership, the Kashmir dispute could be resolved very quickly, as apparently almost occurred with General Musharraf and Dr Singh in the 2000s. Equally quickly, India and/or Pakistan could unilaterally change the status of those areas of J&K under their control, which would effectively end the existence of the imagined entity of J&K. Thus, New Delhi could detach the Jammu and Ladakh areas from the Kashmir Valley and either unite Jammu and Ladakh into a single state, grant each entity territory or state status, or unite these regions with another India state or states, say Punjab and/or Himachal Pradesh. New Delhi also could grant the remaining Kashmir entity genuine autonomy, which, if genuinely genuine (to use a tautology) might appease Kashmiris and resolve India's Kashmir 'headache'. Equally, Islamabad could grant provincial status to either Azad Kashmir and/or Gilgit-Baltistan and then fully integrate one or both of these areas into Pakistan. Any such moves would compel New Delhi to protest to Islamabad that Pakistan has integrated 'integral parts of India' into its nation, although there would little else that India could do short of mounting a difficult, dangerous and dubious military campaign to capture these areas. Equally, the Shia majority who populate Gilgit-Baltistan may decide that secular India, which nation has a large and seemingly content Shia population and of which nation the GBians' region is supposedly an integral part, offers a more appealing choice than increasingly Sunni-dominated Pakistan. Obtaining Gilgit-Baltistan would be strategically beneficial to India. First, it would gain control of the Karakoram Highway. Second, India could access Afghanistan via the difficult, but not impossible, Wakhan Corridor located immediately north of J&K (and through which corridor China may build a railway to a copper mine located south of Kabul), thus negating India's need to access Afghanistan via Pakistan. Third, it would confirm that India's secularism is more powerful than Pakistan's concept of being a homeland for Muslims. These reasons make India's stance to happily, and readily, convert the LOC into the international border, by which India would 'lose' Gilgit-Baltistan, seem strategically short sighted.

Pakistan is currently confronting a major existential issue posed by hardline Taliban/Islamists who are challenging Islamabad's rule and the 'bad' elements of which the Pakistan Army is seeking to militarily subdue. In what Islamabad no longer recognises as duplicitous behaviour, it will use the 'good' elements to shore up Pakistan's position in Afghanistan. However, Pakistan also currently confronts some parlous economic problems, plus an uprising in Balochistan. Its considerable

problems could have a number of effects. First, apart from GBians, Azad Kashmirismight also come to consider India a more attractive option than Pakistan, chiefly because India's economic development is presently far superior to Pakistan's. Conversely, it is possible that few in Indian J&K, except for an indeterminate number of Muslim Kashmiris, particularly those of a hardline Islamic bent, now find very much of appeal in Pakistan. India could therefore call Pakistan's bluff and have the People's Plebiscite held. It might well win both the plebiscite and all of J&K! Blinded by its rhetoric and its deep distrust of Pakistan, New Delhi is unlikely to do so. Second, Pakistan's current crop of serious problems could mean that Islamabad is too distracted to look at J&K in any meaningful way for some time. Equally, confronting such major problems—particularly if these worsen—Islamabad might be more amenable to resolving the Kashmir dispute. To do so, however, Islamabad will have to appease hardline anti-India elements bent on obtaining Muslim-majority Kashmir—and whom the ISI employs as proxy forces. Furthermore, Islamabad will be able to do little in relation to J&K without the absolute approval of the Pakistan Army, which itself has a major interest in ensuring that the Kashmir dispute is not resolved if only to ensure its own size, status and influence. Equally, Islamabad, frustrated with India's unyielding unapproachability, may act in an increasingly belligerent way by using its proxy forces to cause India problems in places such as Kashmir—rather than to resolve the dispute over it. Some in Indian J&K are concerned that this may occur, particularly if Afghanistan becomes stable, a situation that could free up Islamic fighters for a confrontation with 'Hindu' India.

For its part, India's growing economy and international status might make New Delhi less amenable to resolving the Kashmir dispute. As the status quo power, India does not need to be proactive. It has what it, and Pakistan want: the Kashmir Valley. That said, should New Delhi decide to think creatively, which is a distinct possibility under Mr Modi, India will have more largesse with which to tempt the parties to the Kashmir dispute, or with which to 'purchase' territory or support, much as Gulab Singh did in 1846. Whether Pakistan will want to sell is another (and unlikely) matter, but if Pakistan's economic issues continue to worsen, this might be one way of resolving the Kashmir dispute—or at least of moving it forward slightly: Indian economic assistance to Pakistan with a quid pro quo or suitable exchange made in relation to J&K. Given the right, or wrong, circumstances, this is not as silly as it may sound. Indeed, General Musharraf and Dr Singh were onto something when they suggested making the borders and LOC irrelevant. Mutually beneficial India-Pakistan trade, as long as it is broad and without major impediments, could be one effective way to advance the difficult, even parlous, India-Pakistan relationship. The situation in J&K with its five LOC crossing points offers some significant possibilities, although the list of items traded would need to be broadened considerably. Otherwise, all that can be currently said with much certainty about J&K is that India and Pakistan will continue to bicker over it, seemingly without relenting. Neither nation has any compelling reasons of their own to resolve their dispute over J&K. There is no international pressure on either nation to do so. Neither nation sees any need to involve the third party to the dispute, J&K-ites—who might actually be able to resolve the dispute—in any discussions. The Kashmir dispute will therefore continue for some time.

As for speculating about Kashmir itself, three things come to mind. First, given its history and longevity, the entity of Kashmir will continue to exist in some recognisable shape or form in the future. Unless large-scale immigration takes place, Kashmiris will continue to be the majority population in this ancient region. Second, as long as India and Pakistan remain in existence and their dispute over J&K remains unresolved, this prestigious region will continue to be an object desired, and contested, by both nations. Each nation wants the Kashmir Valley for itself, or to deprive its rival

of this region. As Sheikh Abdullah noted, they are like lovers prepared to ‘suffer tremendously for [Kashmir’s] sake’.³ Both nations have suffered since 1947—although nowhere near as much as Kashmiris have. Third, history suggests that, at some stage in future, the international status of Kashmir will change. What it doesn’t suggest is what exactly Kashmir’s next international status will be and when this change may occur. Given the last four-and-a-quarter centuries since Emperor Akbar politically re-integrated Kashmir into the Indian subcontinent in 1586, any change for Kashmir most probably will involve its subjugation and subsumption into another larger entity. One possible entity is China, which is contiguous to J&K and which has become economically and militarily powerful, and possibly attractive to J&K-ites (although I have no evidence for this). If the subcontinent were to fragment into something that resembles the pre-Mughal patchwork of kingdoms, independence for Kashmir might be possible. Otherwise, it seems highly unlikely that Kashmir will obtain this status. The desire of outsiders to possess this prestigious and highly desirable ‘paradise on earth’, as Emperor Jahangir labeled it, is too great. When asked on his deathbed if there was anything he wanted, Jahangir allegedly sighed, ‘Only Kashmir’. Although not yet on their deathbeds, the total inability of India and Pakistan to resolve the Kashmir dispute suggests they have a similar wish. Kashmir and Kashmiris have long been at the centre of J&K and the Kashmir dispute. The only thing that can be said with much certainty is that, given Kashmir’s prestige and desirability, they will remain so for some time.

APPENDIXES

Appendix I: The Mountains of, and around, J&K

Appendix II: Maharajas of the Princely State of Jammu and Kashmir

Appendix III: Rules for Visitors to Kashmir

Appendix IV: Wars in, or over, Jammu and Kashmir since 1947

Appendix V: Districts of Jammu and Kashmir

APPENDIX I

THE MOUNTAINS OF, AND AROUND, J&K

This is a slightly abridged extract from John Keay, *When Men and Mountains Meet: The Explorers of the Western Himalayas 1820–75*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1993, pp. 1–4. Keay provides an excellent description of the complexity and ruggedness of the mountains within the Western Himalayas region. This extract is published with Mr Keay's permission.

... Nowhere on the earth's surface is there a comparable cluster of mountains. In a chaos of contours at the heart, or perhaps the navel, of Asia six major mountain systems lie locked together.

From the south-west, out of the arid hills of Afghanistan, comes the Hindu Kush. Its brown treeless slopes grow higher and steeper as they approach the main complex. In the valleys there are no strips of continuous cultivation, just lush green oases strung together by grey, snow-fed rivers. Even below the glaciers of the 25,000 foot Tirich Mir there is still a hint of the deserts of the Middle East. ...

To the north the Hindu Kush is bounded by the narrow Oxus valley beyond which lie the rounded domes of the Pamirs. This is a still mysterious and almost polar region of several parallel ranges linked together, and to the other chains, by a north-south range which includes the peak Muztagh Ata, 'the father of snowy mountains'. The Arabs call the Pamirs the *Bam-i-Dunya*, or 'Roof of the World', a fitting name for a region where the valleys are not cosy little clefs but open steppes as cold and windswept and almost as high as the peaks that bound them. ...

Corresponding to the Hindu Kush but joining the Pamirs from the east is the third system, the Kun Lun. The Pamirs with their Siberian climate are a fitting contribution from Russia, but the Kun Lun belongs in every sense to China. Rich in jade and overlooking the ancient silk route from Cathay, its row of blue peaks emerging above the dust haze to the south of Kotan have always been regarded as the rim of the Chinese empire in the south-west. ...

Within the angle formed by the junction of these three systems lie the Karakorams. Mightiest of all, they radiate from an amphitheatre of peaks that includes three of the world's six highest. This is a treacherous and perpendicular wilderness where only the mountains can hope to survive. Glaciers 30 miles long and quarter of a mile deep fill the valleys. Anything like level ground is strewn with their moraines. Grazing, let alone cultivation, is practically non-existent; no one actually lives in the Karakorams.

By comparison the Great Himalaya,* in its western reach, is a modest affair. The part which falls within the Western Himalayas is that which is drained by the Indus and its tributaries. It is more broken than on its grand sweep through Nepal, with passes as low as the 11,000 feet Zoji La between Kashmir and Ladakh. ...

... A charming world, one thinks, this Great Himalaya of Ladakh. Yet the culmination of the range in the Nanga Parbat Massif at the heart of the whole mountain complex is a staggering contrast and a worthy climax. Rising almost sheer from the bed of the Indus at 3,000 feet to some 26,000 feet, it

boasts such a host of towering ridges, precipices and peaks that it is often regarded as a range in itself.

Finally there is the Pir Panjal. Lying between the plains of India and the Great Himalaya this, too, steals some of the latter's thunder. By Himalayan standards, it is not high; there are few peaks over 20,000 feet. But, because it rises fairly abruptly from the plains and is the first snow-capped range encountered by the traveller from the south, it deserves separate note. Anywhere else in the world it would surely be rated a noble range. ... Compared to the grim and barren ranges to the north, all is green and beautiful. ... Yet the snowfall here is heavier than anywhere else in the Western Himalayas. The peaks look nearer, higher, less assailable. The passes are every bit as treacherous as those of the other systems and the gradients just as painfully steep.

‘*It is important to distinguish between Himalaya, pronounced like ‘Somalia’, and the Himalayas, as in ‘Malaya’. The first is, strictly, the correct pronunciation, and deriving from two Sanscrit [sic] words meaning “the abode of snow” should be employed in the singular only. I have used it only when referring to a specific mountain chain as in Great Himalaya. Himalayas, always plural, is an Anglicisation which is now more widely used than the correct version. ... it impl[ies] all the mountain systems between the Indian subcontinent and Central Asia.

The area covered by this complex of mountains is nearly the size of France, in shape a broad belt about six hundred miles long by three hundred wide. It was this three hundred [miles] from south to north which confused and dismayed all those who tried to penetrate the mountains. For these six systems are not just ranges. Each has its own network of spurs and subsidiary parallel ranges. Some of them, like the Ladakh range, south of the Karakorams and the Aghil range north of them, are as formidable as their better-known neighbours. Nearly all trend roughly from east to west. A journey across this axis from Punjab to Turkestan involves climbing fifteen major passes, all between nine and nineteen thousand feet high. Excluding the small vale of Kashmir and some elevated Tibetan tundra in the east, there is no level ground between the mountains.

‘A jet today will cross the whole region in less than an hour. It is assuredly the smallest of the theatres of nineteenth century exploration. Yet it ranked with, if not above, all others including Africa, Australia and the Polar regions. It took as long to penetrate, it entailed as much hardship and was invested with as much importance.’

APPENDIX II

MAHARAJAS OF THE PRINCELY STATE OF JAMMU AND KASHMIR

<i>J&K Maharaja</i>	<i>Relationship</i>	<i>Born</i>	<i>Died</i>	<i>Ruled J&K</i>
Gulab Singh*	Dhyan Singh's elder brother**	18.10.1792	7.8.1857#	16.3.1846–February 1856
Ranbir Singh	Gulab's son	1832	12.9.1885	February 1856–12.9.1885
Pratap Singh	Ranbir's son	1850	25.9.1925	12.9.1885–23.9.1925
[Council of State; British Resident]	[Pratap Singh's powers curtailed, then limited]			1889–1905 [then reduced powers until 1922]
Hari Singh##	Son of Raja Amar Singh	30.9.1895	26.4.1961	23.9.1925–20.6.1949
[Yuvraj (Crown Prince) Karan Singh]	[Hari's son; titular head]	[9.3.1931]	[Still alive]	[Regent: 20.6.1949–14.11.1952]^

Key: * Gulab Singh was Raja of Jammu from 1822–46;
 ** Dhyan Singh was equally as influential and important in the Sikh Empire as Gulab Singh;
 # While still alive, Gulab made Ranbir ruler to prevent the British taking direct control of J&K;
 ## Pratap Singh was 'without issue'; Hari Singh was the son of Pratap's younger brother;
 ^ Official Dogra rule of J&K, including Maharaja Hari Singh's rule, terminated on this day. Thereafter, Karan Singh, who had previously been Regent ruling on behalf of his father, served as the elected Sadar-e-Riyasat (Chief of State) of Indian J&K until 30 March 1965, after which he became Governor of Indian J&K, until 15 May 1967. Thereafter, Dr Karan Singh has often served in India's Lok Sabha or Rajya Sabha, usually as a Congress politician.

APPENDIX III

RULES FOR VISITORS TO KASHMIR

Extract from Dr E.F. Neve, *The Tourists Guide to Kashmir, Ladakh, Skardo &c*, Lahore, The Civil and Military Gazette Press, 1920, 12th Edition, Appendix I, pp. 175–6.

An abstract of some of the chief rules may be given as follows:

1. Passes to visit Kashmir must be obtained from the Resident.
2. The Banihal route is considered private, and special permission is required. The ordinary routes open to the public are by Murree, Havelian, Pir Panjal and Poonch.
3. The Resident prescribes certain limits, beyond which travellers may not go without special passes.
4. Visitors may not occupy houses in the town of Srinagar nor camp in certain specified gardens.
5. If carriage is required, thirty hours' notice should be given. Carriage and supplies may not be demanded except at proper stages.
6. Visitors are requested to see that their servants do not import articles for sale on which duty is leviable. They are also responsible that their servants discharge their debts before leaving.
7. Uniform should be worn at State banquets.
8. Certain preserves are fixed for game in addition to the private *jagirs*. Licenses for shooting are necessary, and there are closed seasons, as well as limited number of heads allowed per gun. ...
9. *Fishing* is prohibited in all sacred tanks and between the first and third bridges in Srinagar.

There are also special rules with regard to the occupation of quarters in Srinagar and Gulmarg. For details the official rules should be consulted.

APPENDIX IV

WARS IN, OR OVER, JAMMU AND KASHMIR SINCE 1947

1. May 1948–1 January 1949: India-Pakistan war; limited to J&K; ended with United Nations' brokered ceasefire on 1 January 1949; result was indecisive, although J&K divided thereafter by the 1949 ceasefire line; war followed fighting that began in J&K soon after the British withdrawal in 1947, particularly in the Poonch area of Jammu Province where 'rebels' fought the forces of Maharaja Hari Singh, then Indian forces after he acceded to India on 26 October 1947; the war is dated from May 1948 because Pakistan's armed forces only then officially became involved in J&K.
2. 20 October–21 November 1962: China-India war; fighting in Aksai Chin and north-east India; China won decisively; took place before China-Pakistan relations became intimate.
3. August–22 September 1965: India-Pakistan war; instigated by subversives sent into J&K by Pakistan; fought in J&K and across the western India-Pakistan border; it followed some serious India-Pakistan skirmishing in the Rann of Kutch in March–April 1965; ceasefire declared after international pressure; result was a stalemate.
4. 3–16 December 1971: India-Pakistan war; mainly fought in, and over, East Pakistan, with some fighting in J&K and along the western India-Pakistan border; ended when India, which was supporting anti-West Pakistan Bengali *Mukti Bahini* (freedom fighters), decisively won and bifurcated Pakistan; East Pakistan then became the independent nation of Bangladesh.
5. May 1999: 'War' in Kargil area when the Indian Army and Air Force fought across the Line of Control to regain areas held by 'militants' who, even though Islamabad denied it, mainly comprised soldiers from the Pakistan-armed, -trained and -controlled Northern Light Infantry; India won; considered a war as fighting caused over 1,000 deaths; remained a conventional conflict even though India and Pakistan had confirmed their nuclear military capabilities via tests twelve months before.
6. Since 1988: Kashmiris' anti-India uprising morphed into a proxy war as Pakistan supported pro-Pakistan militants against Indian security forces, mainly in the Kashmir Valley; ongoing, although very much reduced; India has won, although many Kashmiris still are disenchanted with India.

APPENDIX V

DISTRICTS OF JAMMU AND KASHMIR

Pre-accession, princely J&K, 1947:

- **Jammu Province:** two (indirectly ruled) **jagirs** (four tehsils) and **five districts** (seventeen tehsils):
Jagirs: Chenani; Poonch (comprising Bagh, Haveli, Mendhar, Sudhnoti tehsils);
Districts: Jammu (comprising Akhnoor, Jammu, Samba and Sri Ranbirsinghpura tehsils); Kathua (Basohli, Jasmergarh, Kathua tehsils); Mirpur (Bhimber, Kotli, Mirpur tehsils); Reasi (Rampur Rajouri, Reasi tehsils); Udhampur (Bhadrawah, Kishtwar, Ramban, Ramnagar, Udhampur tehsils);
- **Kashmir Province:** three **districts** (ten tehsils): Anantnag (comprising Anantnag, Khas, Kulgam and Pulwama tehsils); Baramulla (Baramulla, Sri Partapsinghpura (popularly known as Handwara), Uttarmachipora (popularly known as Badgam) tehsils); Muzaffarabad (Karnah, Muzaffarabad and Uri tehsils);
- **Frontier Districts:** four **districts** (ten tehsils): Astore; Gilgit Agency (comprising Chilas, Hunza, Ishkuman, Kuh-Ghizar, Nagar, Punial and Yasin tehsils); Gilgit Leased Area; Ladakh District (Kargil, Ladakh and Skardu tehsils).

Post-accession, divided J&K, current situation:

Indian J&K: three divisions; twenty-two districts, eighty-two tehsils (not listed below):

- **Jammu Division: ten districts:** Doda, Jammu, Kathua, Kishtwar, Poonch, Rajouri, Ramban, Reasi, Samba, Udhampur;
- **Kashmir Valley Division: ten districts:** Anantnag, Bandipora, Baramulla, Budgam, Ganderbal, Kulgam, Kupwara, Pulwama, Shopian, Srinagar;
- **Ladakh Division:** two districts: Kargil; Leh.

Pakistan-Administered J&K: two separate and separated regions:

- **Azad Kashmir: three divisions; eight districts:**
Mirpur Division: districts of Mirpur, Bhimber, Kotli;
Muzaffarabad Division: districts of Muzaffarabad, Neelum;
Poonch Division: districts of Poonch, Bagh, Sudhnuti.
- **Gilgit-Baltistan: two divisions; seven districts:**
Gilgit Division: districts of Diamer, Ghizar, Gilgit, Astore, Hunza-Nagar;
Baltistan Division: districts of Skardu, Ghanche.

INTRODUCTION

1. For a book with an argument, please read Christopher Snedden, *The Untold Story of the People of Azad Kashmir*, London, Hurst and Co., 2012, republished in India as Christopher Snedden, *Kashmir: The Unwritten History*, New Delhi, Harper Collins, 2013. I argue, and provide evidence that confirms, that the people of J&K instigated the Kashmir dispute in 1947—and not Pukhtoos from Pakistan, as India has always claimed and in which claim Pakistan surprisingly has acquiesced.
2. Snedden, *The Untold Story of the People of Azad Kashmir*, Conclusion, pp. 217–227.
3. Population information respectively from ‘Pakistan’, *The World Factbook*, Central Intelligence Agency, 20 June 2014, www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/pk.html [accessed 29 July 2014] and ‘India’, *The World Factbook*, Central Intelligence Agency, 22 June 2014, www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/in.html [accessed 29 July 2014].

PART ONE: IMPORTANT ANTECEDENTS

1. See Appendix V: Districts of Jammu and Kashmir.
2. ‘US government asked to correct its maps on India’, (*Indian*) *Ministry of External Affairs*, 21 November 2011, www.mea.gov.in/media-briefings.htm?dtl/7095/US+government+asked+to+correct+its+maps+on+India [accessed 1 December 2012]; Sanjoy Majumder, ‘Economist accuses India of censorship over Kashmir map’, *BBC*, 24 May 2011, www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-south-asia-13529512 [accessed 1 December 2012].
3. United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan [UNCIP], *Report of the Sub-committee on Western Kashmir*, [New York], Unpublished Restricted Document, 31 March 1949, p. 1. Despite the title, this report was divided into three parts: ‘I. Western Kashmir’ which dealt exclusively with Azad Kashmir, ‘II. Gilgit and Baltistan’, and ‘III. Refugees’.
4. ‘Population Estimates’, *United Nations Statistics Division*, [2012?], footnotes 53 and 75, http://unstats.un.org/unsd/mbs/data_files/t01.pdf [accessed 26 October 2012]. The United Nations map of the ‘Jammu and Kashmir Area’ is more sanguine. It does not specifically name any of J&K’s five regions nor does it show which part is under India or under Pakistani control, although it does identify the ‘Vale of Kashmir’ as a geographic feature.
5. The Indus River rises in Tibet, flows through J&K, then through the west of the subcontinent, to the Arabian Sea. It is different from Kashmir’s shorter Sind/Sindh River, a tributary of the Jhelum River.
6. J&K was shown as a ‘Dependent and Subordinate Native State’ on Topographical Department of India, [*Map of*] *India 1872*, Calcutta, Surveyor General’s Office, [1872].
7. The term is still in use, although invariably not by the (secular) Indian Government. For example, *The Hindustan Times*; Hindustan Aeronautics Ltd; Hindustan Unilever Ltd.
8. Graham E. Fuller, *A World Without Islam*, New York, Back Bay Books, 2010, p. 247. Fuller quotes the ‘outstanding Muslim scientist and polymath al-Buruni [who] spent time in India in the

mid-eleventh century observing the society' for the claim of Hinduism being monotheistic.

9. Mir Qasim, *My Life and Times*, New Delhi, Allied Publishers, 1992, p. 31. Qasim was Chief Minister of Indian J&K from 1971–1975.
0. For a list of major India-Pakistan conflicts, see Appendix IV: Wars in, or over, Jammu and Kashmir since 1947.
1. By comparison, the Australian state of Victoria is approximately 87,640 sq. miles (227,010 sq. km) and the modern United Kingdom, comprising Great Britain (England, Scotland and Wales) and Northern Ireland, is approximately 93,410 sq. miles (241,930 sq. km).
2. Snedden, *The Untold Story of the People of Azad Kashmir*, p. 27.
3. For a list of J&K rulers, see Appendix II: Maharajas of the Princely State of Jammu and Kashmir.
4. The terms 'Iran' and 'Persia' are somewhat interchangeable, with all Persians being Iranians, although not vice versa. From 1935, the kingdom of Persia officially changed its name to the older name of Iran, which is more popular, inclusive and widely used by people who populate this area.
5. John Keay, *Eccentric Travellers*, London, John Murray, 1982, p. 191.
6. Prithivi Nath Kaul Bamzai, *A History of Kashmir*, Delhi, Metropolitan Book Co., 1962, p. 397.
7. Wendy Doniger, *The Hindus: An Alternative History*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2010, p. 503, footnote.
8. T.N. Dhar 'Kundan', 'Five Millennia Old Culture & Literature of Kashmir—Some Landmarks', 16 December 2000, *Kashmiri Overseas Association*, <http://koausa.org/culture/oldculture.html> [accessed 17 July 2012], p. 3. At the time of writing (2014), the year is 5090 using this calendar.
9. Keay, *Eccentric Travellers*, p. 197.
0. Colonel Algernon Durand, *The Making of a Frontier: Five Years' Experiences and Adventures in Gilgit, Hunza, Nagar, Chitral, and the Eastern Hindu-Kush*, London, John Murray, 1899, p. 198.
1. G.M.D. Sufi, *Kashir [sic]. Being a History of Kashmir From the Earliest Times to Our Own*, Volume II, Lahore, The University of the Punjab, 1949, pp. 396–7.
2. *Kalhana's Rajatarangini, A Chronicle of the Kings of Kasmir [sic]*, [M.A. Stein, Translator], Mirpur, Verinag Publishers, 1991, [First Published by M/s A. Constable & Co., London, 1900], p. 6.
3. Sufi, *Kashir [sic]. Being a History of Kashmir*, Volume II, p. 52.
4. Lala Ganeshi Lal, *Siyahat-i-Kashmir (Kashmir Nama or Tarikh-i-Kashmir), being An Account of a Journey to Kashmir, March–June 1846*, Translated into English and Annotated by Vidya Sagar Suri, 1954, [Simla?], The Punjab Government, 1955, p. 32.
5. Bamzai, *A History of Kashmir*, pp. 224, 605.
6. *Census of India 1941*, Volume XXII, *Jammu & Kashmir State*, Part III, *Village Tables*, Srinagar, R.G. Wreford, Editor, Jammu and Kashmir Government, 1942, pp. 527–8.
7. Haroon Mirani, 'Holy row in Kashmir over "Jesus tomb"', *Asia Times Online*, 22 May 2010, www.atimes.com/atimes/South_Asia/LE22Df03.html [accessed 1 February 2012], provides a good summation of this story.
8. Details of the shrine to Hazrat Yousaf Asif and Syed Naseer-Ud-Din are from a photo taken by the author in October 2009 at the shrine in Srinagar.
9. See Holger Kersten, *Jesus Lived in India*, London, Element, 1986, and Elizabeth Clare Prophet, *The Lost Years of Jesus: Documentary Evidence of Jesus' 17-Year Journey to the East*, 1987,

Gardiner, Summit University Press. According to Prophet, p. 13, a Russian, 'Nicolas Notovitch', first documented Jesus' study in Ladakh in a book published in 1894 (some of which Prophet reproduces). In 1887, in a Ladakhi monastery, Notovitch was shown a copy of an ancient Buddhist manuscript that told of Jesus studying in India, Kashmir and Ladakh.

0. *Kalhana's Rajatarangini*, Vol. 1, Introduction, p. 81, Appendix I, p. 135, and Second Book, various verses, pp. 61–71.
1. Mark Griffiths, *The Lotus Quest*, London, Chattis & Windus, 2009, p. 160.
2. Shiva is the god; a follower or devotee is a Shaivite. Similarly, Vishnu is the god; a follower or devotee is a Vaishnava.
3. *Abhinavagupta.net*, <http://abhinavagupta.net/abhinavagupta.html> [accessed 25 January 2013].
4. Bamzai, *A History of Kashmir*, pp. 286–291.
5. Bamzai, *A History of Kashmir*, p. 666.
6. 'Geelani opposes separate colonies for Kashmiri Pandits', *Hindustan Times*, 2 July 2012, www.hindustantimes.com/India-news/Srinagar/Geelani-opposes-separate-colonies-for-Kashmiri-Pandits/Article1-882291.aspx [accessed 2 July 2012].
7. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, 'Introductory Essay on Kashmir' in S.N. Dhar, *Kashmir: Eden of the East*, Allahabad, Kitab Mahal, [1945], p. xxvii.
8. Chitralekha Zutshi, *Languages of Belonging: Islam, Regional Identity, and the Making of Kashmir*, London, Hurst and Co., 2004, p. 81.
9. 'Kashmir survives another tragedy', *The Peninsula*, 2 July 2012, www.thepeninsulaqatar.com/india/199579-kashmir-survives-another-tragedy.html [accessed 13 July 2012].
0. Dhar, *Kashmir: Eden of the East*, p. 4.
1. Ibid., p. 24. These lakes and waterways have since been under pressure because of pollution and receding water levels, problems that the Indian J&K Government has been trying to address.
2. Shujaat Bukhari, 'The other Kashmir', *The Hindu*, 14 June 2011, www.the-hindu.com/opinion/op-ed/article2101764.ece [accessed 14 June 2011].
3. Bamzai, *A History of Kashmir*, pp. 9–12, 438, 454–5.
4. Dhar, *Kashmir: Eden of the East*, p. 79.
5. C.E. Tyndale Biscoe, *Kashmir in Sunlight & Shade*, London, Seeley Service, Second Edition, 1925, [First Published 1921?], pp. 78–9.
6. Pandit Anand Koul, *Geography of the Jammu and Kashmir State*, Verinag Publishers, Mirpur, 1991 [Reprint of the Second Edition, 1925], p. 37.
7. E.F. Knight, *Where Three Empires Meet*, London, Longmans, 1895, p. 37.
8. *Census of India 1941*, p. 346.
9. Dhar, *Kashmir: Eden of the East*, pp. 4, 120–4.
0. See Appendix III: Rules for Visitors to Kashmir.
1. Amar Grover, 'Postcard from ... Kashmir: Still a hotspot—but for the right reasons', *Financial Times*, 3 February 2011, www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/2/9abef77e-4819-11e1-b1b4-00144feabdc0.html#axzz1lf489NCY [accessed 7 February 2011].
2. Edmund Candler, *On the Edge of the World*, London, Cassell and Company, 1919, p. 1.
3. *Census of India 1941*, p. 351.
4. Grover, 'Postcard from ... Kashmir: Still a hotspot—but for the right reasons'.
5. 'JK govt [sic] declares 2010 as "Visit Kashmir" year', *Deccan Herald*, 6 January 2010, www.deccanherald.com/content/45240/jk-govt-declares-2010-visit.html [accessed 26 March 2011].

6. Michael Edwardes, *Raj: The Story of British India*, London, Pan, 1969, p. 37.
7. V.P. Menon, *The Story of the Integration of the Indian States*, Bombay, Orient Longman, 1961, p. 3.
8. Shafqat Hussain, 'Small Players in the Great Game: Marginality and Representation on the Northern Frontiers of Nineteenth-Century Colonial India', *South Asia: Journal of South Asian Studies*, Volume XXIX, No. 2, August 2006, p. 237.
9. Peter Hopkirk, *The Great Game: The Struggle for Empire in Central Asia*, New York, Kodansha International, 1992, [first published as *The Great Game: On Secret Service in High Asia* by John Murray, London, 1990], p. 524.
0. G.T. Vigne, *Travels in Kashmir, Ladak [sic], Iskardo*, London, Henry Colburn, 1844, Volume I, Second Edition, pp. xxiv-xxv.
1. William Dalrymple, *Return of a King*, London, Bloomsbury, 2013, p. 78.
2. Vigne, *Travels in Kashmir, Ladak [sic]*, p. xxii.
3. Michael Axworthy, *A History of Iran: Empire of the Mind*, New York, Basic Books, 2008, p. 158.
4. 'Cis' in Latin means 'on the near side of' or 'on this side of'. In this case, it meant the eastern, or British-controlled, side of the Sutlej River.
5. This region now essentially comprises Central Asia.
6. Lieut. Alexander Burnes, *Travels Into Bokhara*, London, Eland, 2012, Kathleen Hopkirk editor, [First published by John Murray, London 1835], p. 9.
7. David Loyn, *Butcher and Bolt*, London, Windmill Books, 2009, p. 82.
8. Dalrymple, *Return of a King*, p. 41.
9. Variations are Pukhtuns/Pakhtoons/Pakhtuns. In Afghanistan, they are known as Pushtoons/Pushtuns/Pashtoons/Pashtuns. The difference in terminology is due to each sub-group having a different dialect in which apparently Pukhtoons have no corresponding 'sh' sound and Pushtoons have no 'kh' sound. According to Charles Allen, *Soldier Sahibs*, London, Abacus, 2001, p. xii, the British called these people 'Pathans', which was an incorrect derivation from 'Paktanah', the plural for Pakhtun.
0. Dalrymple, *Return of a King*, p. 127.
1. Loyn, *Butcher and Bolt*, p. 40.
2. Hopkirk, *The Great Game*, p. 192.
3. Allen, *Soldier Sahibs*, p. 41.
4. Hopkirk, *The Great Game*, p. 270.
5. Alice Albinia, *Empires of the Indus: The Story of a River*, London, John Murray, 2008, pp. 284–7.
6. These Sunni Hazaras are not to be confused with ethnic Shia Hazaras who reside in central Afghanistan and some of whom live, often as refugees, around Quetta, the capital of Balochistan.
7. Gujrat is now both a town and a district in Pakistani Punjab. It is not to be confused with the historic Indian region and modern Indian state of Gujarat, further south.
8. Patwant Singh and Jyoti M. Rai, *Empire of the Sikhs: The Life and Times of Maharaja Ranjit Singh*, London, Peter Owen Publishers, 2008, p. 134.
9. Ben Macintyre, *Josiah the Great, The True Story of the Man Who Would Be King*, London, Harper Perennial, 2004, p. 163.
0. Singh and Rai, *Empire of the Sikhs*, p. 127.
1. Sufi, *Kashir [sic]. Being a History of Kashmir*, Volume II, p. 750.

2. Martin Axmann, *Back to the Future: The Khanate of Kalat and the Genesis of Baloch Nationalism 1915–1955*, Karachi, Oxford University Press, 2012 [first published 2009], p. 26.
3. Narendra Singh Sarila, *The Shadow of the Great Game: the Untold Story of India's Partition*, London, Constable, 2007, p. 244.
4. Loyn, *Butcher and Bolt*, pp. 89, 159–160.
5. R.W. Brock, *The Simon Report on India: An Abridgement*, London, J.M. Dent, 1930, p. 36.
6. Victor Jacquemont, *Letters from India 1829–1832*, translated with an Introduction by Catherine Alison Phillips, London, Macmillan, 1936, pp. xxviii, 183.
7. K.M. Panikkar, *Gulab Singh*, London, Martin Hopkinson, 1930, p. 1.
8. Sufi, *Kashir [sic]. Being a History of Kashmir*, Volume II, p. 752.
9. Vigne, *Travels in Kashmir, Ladak [sic]*, p. 184.
0. Bawa Satinder Singh, *The Jammu Fox*, Carbondale, Southern Illinois University Press, 1974, p. 183.
1. In March 1999, on a trip in Azad Kashmir from Muzaffarabad to Rawalakot, I was informed by some Poonchis at a river I crossed that this was where Gulab Singh had flayed alive some of their forebears.
2. Victor Jacquemont, *Letters from India*, London, Edward Churton, 1834, Volume II, pp. 1, 166, <https://play.google.com/books/reader?id=ugbqJnYQeFAC&printsec=frontcover&output=reader&authuser=0&hl=en&pg=GBS.RA1-PA1> [accessed 18 November 2012].
3. Sufi, *Kashir [sic]. Being a History of Kashmir*, Volume II, p. 754.
4. Singh and Rai, *Empire of the Sikhs*, p. 142.
5. Singh, *The Jammu Fox*, p. 42.
6. Mridu Rai, *Hindu Rulers, Muslim Subjects: Islam, Rights and the History of Kashmir*, London, Hurst and Co., 2004, pp. 23–4.
7. Bamzai, *A History of Kashmir*, p. 598.
8. Singh and Rai, *Empire of the Sikhs*, pp. 218, 232–3.
9. Neville Maxwell, *India's China War*, London, Jonathon Cape, 1970, p. 26.
0. *Gazetteer of Kashmir and Ladak [sic]*, 1992, Delhi, Manas Publications [compiled under the direction of the Quarter Master General in India in the Intelligence Branch and first published in 1890, by the Superintendent of Government Printing, Calcutta], p. 120.
01. Panikkar, *Gulab Singh*, p. 48.
02. Ibid., p. 49.
03. Nancy Hatch Dupree, 'The Question of Jalalabad during the First Anglo-Afghan War', *Asian Affairs*, Vol. 6, No. 1, 1975, p. 57.

PART TWO: JAMMU AND KASHMIR, 1846–1947

1. Singh, *The Jammu Fox*, p. 134 and Allen, *Soldier Sahibs*, p. 83. The quote was from Herbert Edwardes, who, according to Allen (pp. 82–3), was a 'kind-hearted' East India Company employee who worked with Gulab Singh as his political advisor for a time in 1846.
2. A brevet was a commission that promoted an officer to a higher military rank but without any increase in pay.
3. Article 12, 'Treaty between the East India Company and the State of Lahore, concluded at Lahore, 9 March 1846', in Sarwar K. Hasan and Zubeida Hasan, Editors, *Documents on the*

Foreign Relations of Pakistan. The Kashmir Question, Karachi, Pakistan Institute of International Relations, 1966.

4. 'Treaty of Amritsar', *Kashmir Information Network*, www.kashmir-information.com/LegalDocs/TreatyofAmritsar.html [accessed 15 March 2011]. In February 2014, I saw the original Treaty of Amritsar (in Persian), at the Punjab Government Archives, Lahore.
5. Sufi, *Kashir [sic]. Being a History of Kashmir*, Volume II, between pp. 766–7, has a facsimile copy of the receipt for this payment.
6. Knight, *Where Three Empires Meet*, p. 28.
7. Singh, *The Jammu Fox*, p. 120.
8. Forward to Francis Bernier, 'A Voyage to Kachemire, the Paradise of Indostan', in Ros Ballaster, editor, *Fables of the East: Selected Tales 1662–1785*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2005, p. 141.
9. Candler, *On the Edge of the World*, p. 120.
0. Singh, *The Jammu Fox*, p. 120.
1. Richard Holmes, *Sahib: The British Soldier in India, 1750–1914*, London, Harper Perennial, 2006, p. 64.
2. Roderick Matthews, *The Flaws in the Jewel*, Noida, Harper Collins, 2010, p. 141. The term 'XI' refers to the size of a cricket team: it has eleven players.
3. Coincidentally, in the same year (1867), in a real estate transaction similar to the East India Company's sale of Kashmir to Gulab Singh, Russia sold Alaska to the United States for \$7.2 million. While done mainly for financial reasons and because of low profits locally, deterring the British and preventing British expansion and territorial acquisition were also major Russian concerns. Hence, their sale to the (then) less potent United States.
4. Stanley Wolpert, *A New History of India*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, Second Edition, 1982, p. 239.
5. Singh, *The Jammu Fox*, p. xvi.
6. Ibid.
7. W.H. Fitchett, *The Tale of the Great Mutiny*, London, Smith, Elder and Co., 1911, p. 9.
8. Lord Lawrence, 1868, as quoted in the *Gazetteer of Kashmir and Ladakh*, p. 136.
9. Singh, *The Jammu Fox*, pp. 161–2.
0. Sufi, *Kashir [sic]. Being a History of Kashmir*, Volume II, p. 794.
1. James Manor, 'The Demise of Princely Order: A Reassessment', in Robin Jeffrey, Editor, *People, Princes and Paramount Power: Society and Politics in the Indian Princely States*, Delhi, Oxford University Press, 1978, p. 323.
2. These Uzbeks were not related to the Ming Dynasty that ruled China from 1368 to 1644.
3. Dr E.F. Neve, *The Tourists Guide to Kashmir, Ladakh, Skardo &c*, Lahore, The Civil and Military Gazette Press, 1920, 12th Edition, pp. xii-xiii.
4. Singh, *The Jammu Fox*, p. 129, states that this force comprised 30,000 soldiers.
5. Brock, *The Simon Report on India*, pp. 36–7.
6. 'Appendix IV: Indian Army Soldiers from Poonch, Mirpur' in Snedden, *The Untold Story of the People of Azad Kashmir*, pp. 249–251.
7. In 1901, Hazara became part of the newly-created North-West Frontier Province.
8. K.R. Bharti, *Chamba Himalaya: Amazing Land, Unique Culture*, New Delhi, Indus Publishing Company, [2001], p. 72. Even so, Topographical Department of India, *[Map of] India 1872*, shows 'Chumba' as being part of J&K.

9. 'Treaty of Amritsar', *Kashmir Information Network*.
0. Lal, *Siyahat-i-Kashmir*, p. 32.
1. Knight, *Where Three Empires Meet*, p. 62.
2. Sufi, *Kashir [sic]. Being a History of Kashmir*, Volume II, p. 801.
3. Arthur Neve, *Thirty Years in Kashmir*, London, Edwin Arnold, 1913, p. 139.
4. *Census of India 1961*, Volume VI, *Jammu and Kashmir*, Part I-A (i), *General Report*, M.H. Kamili, Superintendent of Census Operations Jammu and Kashmir, Srinagar, Census of India, 1968, p. 36.
5. Survey of India, *[Map of] Jamoo [sic], Kashmir and Adjacent Districts*, Calcutta, Surveyor General's Office, 1861. In the bottom left hand corner is a map of 'Srinagar or City of Kashmir'.
6. Topographical Department of India, *[Map of] India 1872*.
7. Topographical Department of India, *[Map of] Turkestan and the Countries Between the British and Russians Dominions in Asia*, Calcutta, Surveyor General's Office, [1875].
8. *Gazetteer of Kashmir and Ladak*, p. 3.
9. R.C.F. Schomberg, *Between the Oxus and the Indus*, London, Martin Hopkinson, 1935, p. 12.
0. O.H.K. Spate, *India and Pakistan. A General and Regional Geography*, London, Methuen & Co., 1954, p. 387. See also Appendix I: The Mountains of, and around, J&K.
1. John Keay, *The Gilgit Game*, London, John Murray, 1979, p. 6.
2. *Gazetteer of Kashmir and Ladak*, p. 331.
3. Durand, *The Making of a Frontier*, pp. xi, 2.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 119.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 42.
6. Schomberg, *Between the Oxus and the Indus*, p. 174.
7. C.P. Skrine and Pamela Nightingale, *Macartney at Kashgar: New Light on British, Chinese and Russian Activities in Sinkiang, 1890–1918*, Hong Kong, Oxford University Press, 1987, p. 34.
8. Peter Hopkirk, *Setting the East Ablaze*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1984 [reissued 2001], p. 230.
9. Skrine and Nightingale, *Macartney at Kashgar*, p. 9.
0. J.M. Brereton, 'The Panjdeh Crisis, 1885', *History Today*, 1 January 1979, p. 49.
1. Hopkirk, *The Great Game*, pp. 422–4.
2. Durand, *The Making of a Frontier*, p. 41.
3. Skrine and Nightingale, *Macartney at Kashgar*, p. 76.
4. Durand, *The Making of a Frontier*, p. 264.
5. Knight, *Where Three Empires Meet*, pp. 382–383. Knight, a journalist, who took part in this action, describes the whole war in the second half of his book.
6. Hopkirk, *The Great Game*, p. 493.
7. C.P. Skrine, *Chinese Central Asia*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1986 [first published by Methuen and Co., London, 1926], p. 8.
8. At 470,000 sq. miles, Tibet now comprises 13 per cent of Chinese territory. However, the post-1950 Tibet is a much smaller entity than the pre-Communist one, which included the regions of Kham, now in Sichuan Province, and Amdo, now in Qinghai Province. Before 1950, Tibet was 750,000 sq. miles, which amounted to 20 per cent of republican China's claimed territory.
9. Hopkirk, *The Great Game*, p. 507.
0. Hopkirk, *Setting the East Ablaze*, p. 119.
1. British and Red Army soldiers later also clashed in north-western Russia in 1918–20 after

Allied Forces intervened to secure military assets in Archangel and Murmansk in order to stop them from falling into the hands of Bolsheviks or Germans.

2. The other two 'stans' were Kazakhstan and Kirghizstan (Kirghizia).
3. Hopkirk, *Setting the East Ablaze*, p. 230.
4. For example, the Pakistan Ministry of Foreign Affairs' maps, (*Pakistan*) *Ministry of Foreign Affairs*, 'Pakistan Administrative', www.mofa.gov.pk/Maps/PAK_Administrative.jpg, and 'Pakistan', www.mofa.gov.pk/Maps/Pak_Map.jpg [both accessed 17 February 2011].
5. 'Pakistan Administrative', *Ministry of Kashmir Affairs and Gilgit-Baltistan*, www.kana.gov.pk and follow link to 'Media', then 'Events', then 'Map of Pakistan' [accessed 3 January 2013].
6. Map of 'Pakistan and her neighbours', Muhammad Ayub Khan, *Friends Not Masters. A Political Autobiography*, London, Oxford University Press, 1967, inside back cover.
7. See, for example, an Australian Government map of India at smartravel-ler.gov.au, *Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade*, www.smartraveller.gov.au/zw-cgi/view/Advice/India [accessed 31 January 2014].
8. 'US government asked to correct its maps on India', (*Indian*) *Ministry of External Affairs*; Majumder, 'Economist accuses India of censorship over Kashmir map'.
9. See *Jammu and Kashmir Area*: www.un.org/Depts/Cartographic/map/pro-file/kashmir.pdf, *Pakistan*: www.un.org/Depts/Cartographic/map/profile/pakistan.pdf, *South Asia*, www.un.org/Depts/Cartographic/map/profile/Souteast-Asia.pdf, [all accessed 11 July 2012]. The UN also has produced maps of Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Nepal and Sri Lanka, but not of Bhutan, India or the Maldives.
0. Mohan Guruswamy, 'Real Estate vs Realpolitik', *Outlook*, 12 April 1999, <http://m.outlookindia.com/story.aspx?sid=4&aid=207284> [accessed 30 November 2012].
1. Maxwell, *India's China War*, pp. 27, 32, 35.
2. Lee Feigon, *Demystifying Tibet*, London, Profile Books, 2000, p. 119.
3. O.H.K. Spate and A.T.A. Learmonth, *India and Pakistan. A General and Regional Geography*, [London?], Methuen, Revised Third Edition, 1967, p. 368.
4. F.M. Hassnain, *Gilgit: The Northern Gate of India*, New Delhi, Sterling Publishers, 1975, p. 80.
5. Percival Spear, editor, *The Oxford History of India*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1981, Fourth Edition, p. 745.
6. Hassnain, *Gilgit: The Northern Gate of India*, p. 78.
7. Knight, *Where Three Empires Meet*, pp. vii-viii, 28.
8. Dr Karan Singh, Raja Amar Singh's grandson, suggested to me on 1 March 2013 in New Delhi that his grandfather may have been poisoned. Furthermore, Karan's father, Raja (later Maharaja) Hari Singh, built and lived in palaces in Jammu town and Srinagar that were separate from his uncle, Maharaja Pratap Singh, because Hari had concerns that his uncle or, even more so, his uncle's wives and retainers, might threaten Hari's personal safety and physical wellbeing. Similarly, Karan Singh was born in Cannes, France, because his father felt that this would be safer for the father, mother and child, and heir, than being in J&K.
9. '35 Restoration of Powers to Maharaja Pratap Singh', in Mohan Krishen Teng, Ram Krishen Kaul Bhatt and Santosh Kaul, editors, *Kashmir Legal Documents*, Second Edition, January 2006, <http://ikashmir.net/historical-documents/doc/historicaldocuments.pdf> [accessed 25 March 2013] (first published by Light & Life Publishers, [New Delhi], 1977), pp. 49–51.
0. C.E. Bechhofer Roberts, *The Mr. A Case*, London, Jarrolds, [1950], pp. 9, 10, 35.

1. Details of State Subject status from Manzoor Fazili, *Kashmir Government and Politics*, Srinagar, Gulshan Publishers, 1982, pp. 131–3.
2. Ian Copland, ‘Islam and Political Mobilization in Kashmir, 1931–34’, *Pacific Affairs*, Volume 54, Number 2, 1981, p. 231.
3. Karan Singh, *Autobiography*, Delhi, Oxford University Press, 1994, p. 40.
4. Balraj Puri, *Jammu—A Clue to the Kashmir Triangle*, Delhi, Balraj Puri, 1966, pp. 40, 50.

PART THREE: FROM PRINCELY STATE TO DISPUTED STATE

1. Some consider that this ‘jewel’ was flawed. For example, Matthews, *The Flaws in the Jewel*.
2. Information on the princely states is from Charles Allen and Sharada Dwivedi, *Lives of the Indian Princes*, London, Arena, 1984, pp. 2–3. The authors state that there were 565 princely states, although the figures that they provide for the three tiers of princely states only add up to 562.
3. Fazili, *Kashmir Government and Politics*, p. 8.
4. Prem Nath Bazaz, *Inside Kashmir*, Mirpur, Verinag Publishers, 1987, [First Published by Kashmir Pub [sic]. Company, Srinagar, 1941], p. 224.
5. R. Coupland, *Indian Politics 1936–1942*, London, Oxford University Press, 1943, p. 339. The princely state of Hyderabad, the nominal remnant of which is the south Indian city of Hyderabad, is not to be confused with the second largest city in Pakistan’s Sindh Province, also called Hyderabad.
6. Brock, *The Simon Report on India*, p. 30.
7. *The Census of Azad Kashmir, 1951*, Murree?, Iftikhar Ahmad, Chief Enumeration Officer, Government of Azad Kashmir, 1952, p. 6.
8. Population figures from I.S. Jehu, Editor, *The India and Pakistan Year Book 1948*, Bombay, Bennett, Coleman & Co., [1948], p. 25.
9. Rai, *Hindu Rulers, Muslim Subjects*, pp. 37–9.
0. The first post-war decolonisation was the granting of independence to the Philippines by the United States on 4 July 1946.
1. The otherwise well informed Pakistani academic, Pervez Hoodbhoy, Editor, *Confronting the Bomb: Pakistani and Indian Scientists Speak Out*, Karachi, Oxford University Press, 2013, p. 117, states that the ‘rules of Partition’ for the ‘British Indian Empire’ were that ‘Muslim-majority areas were to go to Pakistan, Hindu-majority ones to India’. Had India abided by these rules, ‘Kashmir would likely have become part of Pakistan’ as it had a Muslim-majority population. However, J&K was a princely state for which the only valid ‘rule’ was that its ruler, in this case the (Hindu) Maharaja, himself decided whether J&K would join India or Pakistan. India and Pakistan supposedly had nothing to do with his decision.
2. Allen and Dwivedi, *Lives of the Indian Princes*, p. 246. In 1971, India ended princely privileges and most privy purses via a constitutional amendment.
3. While the discussion below makes it appear that India’s final Viceroy, Lord Mountbatten, was solely responsible for the British departure from India in 1947, the previous Viceroy, Lord Wavell (October 1943–February 1947) also held serious discussions with Indians of various persuasions. However, Mountbatten’s glamour and frenetic activity quickly overshadowed Wavell’s lower-key efforts. On Wavell’s important period in office as Viceroy, see Victoria Schofield, *Wavell: Soldier & Statesman*, Barnsley, Pen & Sword Military, 2010 [first published

by John Murray (Publishers), 2006], pp. 291–378.

4. See Aitzaz Ahsan, *The Indus Saga and the Making of Modern Pakistan*, Lahore, Nehru Ghar Publications, 2000, [First published by Oxford University Press, 1996].
5. Hector Bolitho, *Jinnah, Creator of Pakistan*, London, John Murray, 1954, p. 99.
6. Mohd Aslma Khan, Rahmat Ali, Sheikh Mohd Sadiq and Inayat Ullah Khan, *Now or Never: Are We to Live or Perish forever?*, 28th January 1933, no original publication details, copy available at www.mediamonitors.net/nowornever.html [accessed 17 July 2012].
7. ‘Choudhary Rahmat Ali, Pakistan The Fatherland of the Pak Nation (London: The Pak National Liberation Movement, 1947), p. 225’, as quoted in Khalid B. Sayeed, *The Political System of Pakistan*, Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1967, p. 39 [italics as per Sayeed].
8. Urdu is similar to the languages of Hindustani and Hindi. Although the term ‘Hindustani’ is no longer widely used, Hindustani was the language widely spoken across northern parts of British India. Hindi is spoken widely throughout northern post-British India. Hindi and English are India’s chief official national languages. Apart from being Pakistan’s national language, Urdu is on the Eighth Schedule of the Indian Constitution that lists twenty-two official languages. It is spoken throughout northern India and in other parts of India, chiefly around Hyderabad and in Indian J&K.
9. Sarila, *The Shadow of the Great Game*, p. 68.
0. Coupland, *Indian Politics 1936–1942*, pp. 198–201.
1. Section 1, *Indian Independence Act 1947*, London, Parliament of the United Kingdom, 1947, p. 1, www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/Geo6/10–11/30 [accessed 22 March 2013].)
2. *Government of India Act 1935*, London, Parliament of the United Kingdom, 1935. (‘Original version (as it was originally enacted)’ downloadable at www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/Geo5and1Edw8/26/2/enacted [accessed 22 March 2012].)
3. Section 7 (b), *Indian Independence Act 1947*, Parliament of the United Kingdom, p. 4.
4. Section 2 (4), *Indian Independence Act 1947*, Parliament of the United Kingdom, p. 2.
5. Menon, *The Story of the Integration of the Indian States*, p. 119.
6. *Keesing’s Contemporary Archives*, London, Longman, Volume VI (1947), p. 8860.
7. See ‘Pakistan Administrative’ [map], (*Pakistan*) Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
8. Menon, *The Story of the Integration of the Indian States*, p. 128.
9. ‘S/2010/10: Summary statement by the Secretary-General on matters of which the Security Council is seized and on the stage reached in their consideration’, *United Nations*, 21 January 2010, <http://unispal.un.org/UNISPAL.NSF/53936ddf3dd093a1852575530073f2e6/3bba5b8a0fd92a678OpenDocument> [accessed 29 March 2011].
0. Manor, ‘The Demise of Princely Order: A Reassessment’, p. 323.
1. Lord Birdwood, *Two Nations and Kashmir*, London, Robert Hale, 1956, p. 42; Menon, *The Story of the Integration of the Indian States*, p. 376.
2. Sir Albion Bannerji, Foreign and Political Minister of J&K 1927–29, quoted in Bamzai, *A History of Kashmir*, p. 650. Bannerji is also spelt Banerjee, or Banerji.
3. Michael Brecher, *The Struggle for Kashmir*, New York, Oxford University Press, 1953, p. 161.
4. Letter to Begum Abdullah, 4 June 1947, in S. Gopal, General Editor, *Selected Works of Jawaharlal Nehru*, Volume 3, New Delhi, Jawaharlal Nehru Memorial Fund, 1985, p. 197.
5. Chaudhri Muhammad Ali, *The Emergence of Pakistan*, New York, Columbia University Press, 1967, pp. 287, 297.

6. Muhammad Yusuf Saraf, *Kashmiris Fight—For Freedom*, Volume II (1947–1978), Lahore, Ferozsons, 1979, p. 771.
7. *Dawn*, 11 May 1947.
8. Sarila, *The Shadow of the Great Game*, pp. 300–2. Sarila mounts an interesting argument that some senior British planned and created Pakistan, particularly West Pakistan, for strategic reasons in order to monitor the old foe, Russia/ USSR. Lord Wavell drew maps with envisaged boundaries. To ensure Muslim support for the war effort and to weaken Congress, the British began engaging with Jinnah about the creation of a Muslim homeland from around the start of World War II. This empowered Jinnah, gave him greater political standing and ‘had far reaching consequences’ (p. 92).
9. Anindita Dasgupta, ‘Remembering Sylhet: A Forgotten Story of India’s 1947 Partition’, *Economic and Political Weekly*, 2 August 2008, p. 19.
0. *Civil & Military Gazette*, Lahore, 29 July 1947.
1. Victoria Schofield, *Wavell: Soldier & Statesman*, p. 346 and pp. 465–466, footnote 67.
2. Karan Singh speaking about his father, Maharaja Hari Singh, as quoted in Allen and Dwivedi, *Lives of the Indian Princes*, p. 216.
3. Karan Singh, *Autobiography*, pp. 41–2, 48.
4. For a detailed discussion and evidence about how the people of J&K instigated the Kashmir dispute, see Snedden, *The Untold Story of the People of Azad Kashmir*, chapters 2, 3.
5. UNCIP, *Report of the Sub-committee on Western Kashmir*, Annexes, p. 51.
6. *Civil & Military Gazette*, 20 September 1947.
7. *The Times*, London, 10 August 1948.
8. For a discussion of this matter, see Christopher Snedden, ‘What Happened to Muslims in Jammu? Local identity, the “Massacre” of 1947 and the Roots of the Kashmir “Problem”’, *South Asia: Journal of South Asian Studies*, Vol. XXIV, no. 2, 2001.
9. *The Census of Azad Kashmir, 1951*, p. 13. According to the *Census of India 1941*, various pages, 10 per cent of the population of Poonch Jagir was non-Muslim. In Mirpur District, about 20 per cent of the population was non-Muslim. These amounted to almost 102,000 people. Muzaffarabad Tehsil, all of which became part of Azad Kashmir, also had about 12,000 Hindus and Sikhs. Many Hindus and Sikhs either fled from these areas, were abducted or were killed.
0. H.L. Bhagotra, ‘Foreword’, in C.P. Gupta, *The Directory of Mirpur Mahajan Families Settled in Jammu*, Jammu, Mirpur Mahajan Sabha, 1997.
1. Ijaz Hussain, *Kashmir Dispute. An International Law Perspective*, Islamabad, Quaid-i-Azam University, 1998, pp. 75–8.
2. *Jammu & Kashmir 1947–50. An Account of activities of first three years of Sheikh Abdullah’s Government, Jammu, [Government of Jammu and Kashmir?]*, The Ranbir Government Press, 1951, p. ii.
3. Andrew Whitehead, *A Mission in Kashmir*, New Delhi, Penguin Viking, 2007, p. 51. Whitehead meticulously discusses the Pukhtoons’ invasion of J&K and its various effects and ramifications.
4. See Enclosure, Nehru to Patel, 5 October 1947, in Durga Das, Editor, *Sardar Patel’s Correspondence 1945–50, Volume I, New Light on Kashmir*, Ahmedabad, Navajivan Publishing House, 1971, p. 54; Patel to Sardar Baldev Singh, 7 October 1947, in Das, *Sardar Patel’s Correspondence*, p. 59; Patel to Maharaja of Jammu and Kashmir, 2 October 1947, in P.N. Chopra, Chief Editor, *The Collected Works of Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel*, Delhi, Volume XII, Konark Publishers, 1998, p. 211.

5. M. Ganju, *This is Kashmir (With Special Reference to U.N.O.)*, Delhi, S. Chand & Co, [1948], p. 21, states that, although this ‘calamity’ began at 4.30 a.m. on 22 October 1947, ‘vague’, yet chaos-inducing, reports of it reached Srinagar on the evening of 24 October when people in Srinagar were celebrating both the Hindu festival of Dussehra (the death of Ravan) and the Muslim festival of Id (the end of Ramadan). On p. 24, Ganju states that Srinagar was only out of danger on 7 November 1947.
6. Whitehead, *A Mission in Kashmir*, pp. 129–131.
7. Ibid., p. 8.
8. Ayub Khan, *Friends Not Masters*, p. 31.
9. Part D, ‘Proceedings on the sub-continent’, First Interim Report of the United Nations Commission on India and Pakistan, in M.S. Deora and R. Grover, Editors, *Documents on Kashmir Problem*, Volume X, New Delhi, Discovery Publishing House, 1991, p. 28.
0. *Keesing’s Contemporary Archives*, Volume VI (1947), p. 8931.
1. For an example of a Pakistani writing about Kautilya-inspired Indian deviousness, see Masood-Ur-Rehman Khattak, ‘Indian Strategic Thinking: A Reflection Of Kautilya’s Six Fold Policy—Analysis’, *Eurasia Review*, 30 March 2011, www.eurasiareview.com/indian-strategic-thinking-a-reflection-of-kautilyas-six-fold-policy-analysis-29032011/?utm_source=feedburner&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=Feed%3A+eurasiareview%2FVsn [accessed 30 March 2011].
2. Hoodbhoy, *Confronting the Bomb: Pakistani and Indian Scientists Speak Out*, p. 132.
3. Justice Syed Manzoor Hussain Gilani, *The Constitution of Azad Jammu & Kashmir (In the historical backdrop with corresponding Pakistan, India & Occupied Jammu and Kashmir Constitutions)*, Islamabad, National Book Foundation, 2008, p. 664.
4. Ibid., Appendixes XIV–XVII, pp. 665–673.
5. ‘Statement of the Representative of Pakistan, Sir Mohammad Zafrulla Khan, in the Security Council, 16 and 17 January 1948’, in Hasan and Hasan, *Documents on the Foreign Relations of Pakistan. The Kashmir Question*, p. 158. For Zafrulla, Gilgit ‘joins the border of the [USSR] in the north-west’, which was incorrect: Afghanistan’s Wakhan Corridor separated Gilgit from the USSR.
6. *New York Times*, 6 November 1947.
7. *Keesing’s Contemporary Archives*, Volume VI (1947), p. 8931.
8. Article 34 and Article 35, ‘Chapter VI: Pacific Settlement of Disputes’, *Charter of the United Nations*, www.un.org/en/documents/charter/chapter6.shtml [accessed 24 March 2011].
9. ‘Resolution 47: The India–Pakistan Question (21 Apr)’, *United Nations Security Council Resolutions—1948*, www.un.org/documents/sc/res/1948/scres48.htm [accessed 15 August 2003].
0. See Christopher Snedden, ‘Would a Plebiscite Have Resolved the Kashmir Dispute?’, *South Asia: Journal of South Asian Studies*, Vol. XXVIII, No. 1, April 2005.
1. J.N. Dixit, ‘A Defining Moment’, in editor unknown, *Guns and Yellow Roses: Essays on the Kargil War*, New Delhi, Harper and Collins, 1999, p. 189.
2. See Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, London, Verso, 1963.
3. ‘Resolution 47: The India–Pakistan Question (21 Apr)’, *UNSC Resolutions—1948*.
4. UNCIP, *Report of the Sub-committee on Western Kashmir*, Annexes, pp. 10, 11, 14.
5. Sibbanlal Saxena to Sardar Patel, 27 July 1949, in Das, *Sardar Patel’s Correspondence*, p. 286.

PART FOUR: CONTEMPORARY, AND DIVIDED, J&K

1. *Civil & Military Gazette*, Lahore, 21 October 1947.
2. Based on many personal visits to, and research in, India since 1981, many Indians mistrust Kashmiris. See also Tavleen Singh, *Kashmir. A Tragedy of Errors*, New Delhi, Viking, 1995, pp. 1–17.
3. *The Times*, London, 29 October 1947.
4. Mehr Chand Mahajan, *Looking Back*, New Delhi, Har-Anand Publications, 1994, [First Published 1963?], p. 162.
5. Qasim, *My Life and Times*, p. 189.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 61.
7. Balraj Puri, *Simmering Volcano. Study of Jammu's Relations with Kashmir*, New Delhi, Sterling Publishers, 1983, p. 5.
8. Reeta Chowdhari Tremblay, 'Jammu: Autonomy Within an Autonomous Kashmir?', in Raju G.C. Thomas, Editor, *Perspectives on Kashmir. The Roots of Conflict in South Asia*, Boulder, Westview Press, 1992, p. 155. Tremblay plausibly argues this on pp. 153–167.
9. Peter Lyon, 'Kashmir', *International Relations: Journal of David Davies Memorial Institute of International Studies*, Volume 3, Number 2, October 1966, p. 113.
0. 'Excerpts from the Memorandum Submitted by Shri Chhewang Rigzin; President Buddhist Association Ladakh to the Prime Minister of India on behalf of the People of Ladakh in 1949', in Bal Raj Madhok, *Jammu Kashmir and Ladakh. Problem & Solution*, New Delhi, Reliance Publishing, 1987, Appendix V, pp. 68–71.
1. *The Testament of Sheikh Abdullah*, New Delhi, Palit and Palit, 1974, p. 33.
2. *Administration Report of Jammu and Kashmir for the years, 2011 (13th April 1954–12th April 1955)*, [Srinagar?], Jammu and Kashmir Government, [1955?], pp. 4–5. The year 2011 was from a Hindu calendar used by Dogra Maharajas and the initial successor regime in Indian J&K.
3. Adarsh Sein Anand, *The Development of the Constitution of Jammu & Kashmir*, New Delhi, Light & Life, 1980, pp. 158, 240, 244.
4. *Administration Report of Jammu and Kashmir for the Year 1958–59 (1st April 1958–31st March 1959)*, Srinagar, Government of Jammu and Kashmir, 1960, pp. 6, 7.
5. *Administration Report of Jammu and Kashmir for the Year 1959–60 (1st April 1959–31st March 1960)*, Srinagar, Government of Jammu and Kashmir, 1961, p. v.
6. *Administration Report of Jammu and Kashmir for the Year 1961–62 (1st April 1961–31st March 1962)*, Srinagar, Government of Jammu and Kashmir, 1963, p. 4.
7. Balraj Puri, *Jammu and Kashmir. Triumph and Tragedy of Indian Federalisation*, New Delhi, Sterling Publishers, 1981, pp. 236–240 and Appendix 'L', pp. 241–271.
8. Sumantra Bose, *The Challenge in Kashmir. Democracy, Self-Determination and a Just Peace*, New Delhi, Sage Publications, 1997, p. 34.
9. Qasim, *My Life and Times*, pp. 138–140.
0. Tavleen Singh, *Kashmir. A Tragedy of Errors*, p. 98.
1. *Ibid.*, p. 99.
2. For a detailed analysis of the Kashmiris' anti-India uprising, see Christopher Snedden, 'Kashmir: Placating frustrated people', in Edward Aspinall, Robin Jeffrey and Anthony Regan, editors, *Diminishing Conflicts in Asia and the Pacific: Why some subside and others don't*, London, Routledge, 2013.

3. 'J-K Civil Secretariat to reopen in Jammu on Nov 8', *Indian Express*, www.indianexpress.com/news/J-K-Civil-Secretariat-to-reopen-in-Jammu-on-Nov-8/704492 [accessed 15 March 2011].
4. The only other Indian states with bicameral political systems at this stage are Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Karnataka, Maharashtra and Uttar Pradesh.
5. Geoffrey Tyson, *Nehru: The Years of Power*, London, Pall Mall Press, 1966, p. 187.
6. High Court of Judicature, Azad Jammu and Kashmir, *Verdict on Gilgit and Baltistan (Northern Area)*, Mirpur, Kashmir Human Rights Forum, [1993?], pp. 134–139.
7. For a detailed study of Azad Kashmir, see Snedden, *The Untold Story of the People of Azad Kashmir*, Chapters 4–8.
8. Part V, 'Analysis of the Main Problems, Third Interim Report of the United Nations Commission on India and Pakistan', in Deora and Grover, Editors, *Documents on Kashmir Problem*, p. 274.
9. Also spelt *biraderi*. It is pronounced 'brard-ree'. See Snedden, *The Untold Story of the People of Azad Kashmir*, pp. 128–133.
0. Raja Riaz, 'The road to ruling Muzaffarabad passes through Islamabad', *Daily Times*, 28 July 2010.
1. See AJ&K Cabinet, *Azad Jammu & Kashmir* website, www.ajk.gov.pk/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=394&Itemid=15 [accessed 25 February 2014], two pages.
2. *Census of India 1941*, p. 182.
3. Afshan Subohi, 'Workers' remittances build a new city', *Dawn*, 23 February 2009.
4. High Court of Judicature, *Verdict on Gilgit and Baltistan (Northern Area)*, p. 138.
5. F. M. Khan, (edited by Habib R. Sulemani), *The Story of Gilgit Baltistan and Chitral*, Gilgit, Eejaz Literary Agents & Publishers, 2002, pp. 67–8.
6. *Ibid.*, pp. 65–6.
7. Matthias Weinreich, *Pashtun Migrants in the Northern Areas of Pakistan*, Karachi, Oxford University Press, 2011, p. 29.
8. UNCIP, *Report of the Sub-committee on Western Kashmir*, Annexes, p. 115.
9. Weinreich, *Pashtun Migrants in the Northern Areas of Pakistan*, p. 41.
0. Navnita Chadha Behera, *Demystifying Kashmir*, Washington D.C., Brookings Institution Press, 2006, p. 196.
1. 'Pakistan Rejects the Indian Protest on Gilgit-Baltistan, the Self Rule Order,' (*Pakistan*) Ministry of Foreign Affairs, www.mofa.gov.pk/press_releases/2009/Sep/PR_347_09.htm [accessed 6 March 2011].
2. 'Gilgit-Baltistan (Empowerment and Self-Governance) Order, 2009', Government of Gilgit-Baltistan, www.gilgitbaltistan.gov.pk/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=65&Itemid=110 [accessed 7 March 2011].
3. *The Azad Jammu and Kashmir Interim Constitution Act, 1974 (Amended upto [sic] date) May 1997*, Muzaffarabad, Azad Govt. of the State of Jammu & Kashmir (Law, Justice and Parliamentary Affairs Deptt.), 1997, p. 1.
4. 'An Update on Gilgit-Baltistan Elections', *The Researchers*, Islamabad, [2009?] www.theresearchers.org/Post&Update/Gilgit-Baltistan%20Elections.pdf [accessed 7 September 2014], p. 2.
5. 'From the fringes: Gilgit-Baltistanis silently observe elections', *Dawn*, 1 May 2013, www.dawn.com/news/794958/from-the-fringes-gilgit-baltistanis-silently-observe-elections

[accessed 8 September 2014].

6. 'Report submitted by the United Nations Representative for India and Pakistan, Sir Owen Dixon, to the Security Council, 15 September 1950', in Hasan and Hasan, *Documents on the Foreign Relations of Pakistan. The Kashmir Question*, p. 254.
7. Ibid., p. 267.
8. Ibid.
9. Ibid, pp. 276, 277.
0. 'The Kashmir Accord Statement of Smt. Indira Gandhi Prime Minister, in Parliament on Jammu & Kashmir on February 24' and 'Copy of a letter of Sheikh Mohd. Abdullah to the Prime Minister [Indira Gandhi] ... dated 11.2.75', in Abdul Jabbar Ganai, *Kashmir and National Conference and Politics (1975–1980)*, Srinagar, Gulshan Publishers, 1984, pp. 160, 162–3.
1. It is impossible to control what an upper riparian nation does on a river. In 2009, China built a dam on the Indus River near where it rises in the Tibetan Plateau. Downstream Bangladesh has issues with upstream India, including over India's impeding of water flows via Farakka Barrage.
2. Robert Wirsing, 'The Kashmir Territorial Dispute: The Indus Runs Through It', *Brown Journal of World Affairs*, Fall/Winter 2008, Vol. XV, Issue I, p. 227.
3. PCA Press Release, *Indus Waters Kishenganga Arbitration (Pakistan V. India)*, Permanent Court of Arbitration, The Hague, 21 December 2013.
4. 'Hafiz Saeed alleges India of "water terrorism"', *Pakistan Today*, www.pakistan-today.com.pk/2014/09/10/national/hafiz-saeed-alleges-india-of-water-terrorism/.
5. Bruce Grant, *Gods and Politicians: Politics as Culture—An Australian View of India*, Ringwood, Penguin, 1984, p. 94.
6. Maxwell, *India's China War*, pp. 88–9, 267.
7. Jawaharlal Nehru, *India's Foreign Policy, Selected Speeches, September 1946—April 1961*, [New Delhi], Publications Division, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India, 1961, p. 332.
8. Edward Wong, 'Waiting for Reincarnation at a Spiritual Birthplace', *New York Times*, 26 August 2009, www.nytimes.com/2009/08/26/world/asia/26dalailama.html [accessed 24 January 2012].
9. '15th round of talks between the Special Representatives of India and China on the Boundary Question', (Indian) Ministry of External Affairs, 17 January 2012, www.mea.gov.in/mystart.php?id=100518926 [accessed 26 February 2012]; 'Foreign Ministry Spokesperson Liu Weimin's Regular Press Conference on January 17, 2012', Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China, 18 January 2012, www.fmprc.gov.cn/eng/xwfw/s2510/2511/t897133.htm [accessed 26 February 2012].
0. Maxwell, *India's China War*, pp. 216–17.
1. Speech to the United Nations Security Council on 22 June 1962 by India's Defence Minister, Krishna Menon, quoted in Sisir Gupta, *Kashmir. A Study in India-Pakistan Relations*, Bombay, Asia Publishing House, 1966, p. 428.
2. 'Bus service between Islamabad, Kashgar from August' *Dawn*, <http://archives.dawn.com/2007/05/16/nat14.htm> [accessed 8 February 2013].
3. Brian Cloughley, *A History of the Pakistan Army*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, Second Edition, 2000, pp. 222–238.
4. Hoodbhoy, *Confronting the Bomb: Pakistani and Indian Scientists Speak Out*, p. 120.
5. D.R. Khullar, *India: A Comprehensive Geography*, Ludhiana, Kalyani Publishers, Second Edition, 2006, p. 12, states that 'On an average India spends about Rs. 4 crore per day for

maintaining troops in this hostile area. Pakistan also spends about Rs. 1 crore for the same purpose.’

6. ‘Army, Police Turn Up Heat on Kashmir Militants’, *freepresskashmir*, 25 February 2014, <http://freepresskashmir.com/army-police-turn-up-heat-on-kashmir-militants-061825/> [accessed 26 February 2014].
7. ‘Pakistan is Always Seen as the Rogue: SPIEGEL Interview with Pervez Musharraf (Interview conducted by Susanne Koelbl)’, *Spiegel*, 4 October 2010, www.spiegel.de/international/world/0,1518,721110,00.html [accessed 6 October 2010].
8. ‘Fatalities in Terrorist Violence 1988—2014’, *South Asia Terrorism Portal*, www.satp.org/satporgtp/countries/india/states/jandk/data_sheets/annual_casualties.htm [accessed 26 February 2014].
9. Bruce Reidel, *Avoiding Armageddon: America, India, and Pakistan to the Brink and Back*, Washington D.C., The Brookings Institution, 2013, p. 197.
0. Zulfqar Khan and Rizwana Abbasi, ‘Regional-centric Deterrence: Reassessing its Efficacy for South Asia’, *The Korean Journal of Defense Analysis*, Vol. 25, no. 4, December 2013, p. 495.
1. Muzamil Jaleel, “‘It Was Not Our War’”, in editor unknown, *Guns and Yellow Roses*, p. 83.
2. Nawaz Sharif’s mother is apparently an ethnic Kashmiri from the northern Leepa Valley. He is of Kashmiri-Punjabi descent from an ‘old’ Kashmiri family (like Nehru’s).
3. William J. Clinton, ‘Remarks at the One America Meeting With Religious Leaders’, 9 March 2000, *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: WILLIAM J. CLINTON*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Book I, 2000, www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/PPP-2000-book1/html/PPP-2000-book1-doc-pg422.htm, [accessed 3 September 2014].
4. Luv Puri, *Across the Line of Control: Inside Pakistan-Administered Jammu and Kashmir*, New York, Columbia University Press, 2012, p. 77.
5. Altaf Hussain Kira, *Cross-LoC trade in Kashmir: From Line of Control to Line of Commerce*, Mumbai, Indira Gandhi Institute of Development Research, 2011 www.igidr.ac.in/pdf/publication/WP-2011-020.pdf [accessed 28 February 2014].
6. *State Earthquake Reconstruction & Rehabilitation Agency (SERRA)*, Govt. of AJ&K [sic], 2006, unpublished handout, copy obtained by author in Azad Kashmir in December 2006, pp. 2–3.
7. L. F. Rushbrook Williams, *The State of Pakistan*, London, Faber and Faber, Second (Revised) Edition, 1966, pp. 94–5.

PART FIVE: RESOLVING THE KASHMIR DISPUTE

1. Moeed Yusuf and Adil Najam, ‘Kashmir: ripe for resolution?’, *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 30, no. 8, 2009.
2. Inder Malhotra, ‘Immoveable objects’, *Indian Express*, www.indianexpress.com/news/immovable-objects/575870/0 [accessed 20 February 2011] provides the 1,500 figure; A.G. Noorani, ‘Unravelling history’, *Frontline*, Volume 30, Issue 1, 12–25 January 2013, gives the 3,500 figure.
3. UNCIP, *Report of the Sub-committee on Western Kashmir*, Annexes, p. 94.
4. ‘Resolution 39: The India-Pakistan Question (20 Jan)’, *United Nations Security Council Resolutions—1948*, www.un.org/documents/sc/res/1948/scres48.htm [accessed 15 August 2003].

5. 'Resolution 47: The India–Pakistan Question (21 Apr)', *UNSC Resolutions—1948*.
6. In 1948, participating nations were Australia, Belgium, Canada, Chile, Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, Italy, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, United States and Uruguay. In 2013, participating nations were Chile, Croatia, Finland, Italy, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Sweden, Thailand and Uruguay.
7. 'Security Council Resolution 307 (1971) (of 21 December 1971)', <http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/RESOLUTION/GEN/NR0/261/67/IMG/NR026167.pdf?OpenElement> [accessed 23 February 2011].
8. S/1996/603*, 22 August 1996, *United Nations Security Council*, <http://domino.un.org/UNISPAL.NSF/3822b5e39951876a85256b6e0058a478/c0924183a7f95851> [accessed 18 July 2007].
9. S/1996/704, 29 August 1996, *United Nations Security Council*, <http://daccessdds.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N96/223/44/PDF/N9622344.pdf?OpenElement> [accessed 18 July 2007].
0. 'India welcomes exclusion of J&K from U.N. list', *The Hindu*, 15 November 2010; 'UN removes Jammu and Kashmir from list of disputes', *The Daily Times*, 16 November 2010.
1. 'S/2010/10: Summary statement by the Secretary-General on matters of which the Security Council is seized ...'.
2. 'Article 257, Provision relating to the State of Jammu and Kashmir, Part XII (contd), Miscellaneous, Chapter 4. General', *The Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan*, www.pakistani.org/pakistan/constitution/part12.ch4.html [accessed 18 March 2009]. This also was Article 203 in the 1956 Constitution: see Gupta, *Kashmir. A Study in India-Pakistan Relations*, pp. 405–406.
3. The members of SAARC are (in alphabetical order): Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, the Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan, and Sri Lanka.
4. Wirsing, 'The Kashmir Territorial Dispute: The Indus Runs Through It', p. 235.
5. 'Musharraf thinks out-of-box to resolve Kashmir', *The Financial Express*, 26 January 2006.
6. Syed Rifaat Hussain, 'Pakistan's Changing outlook on Kashmir', *Kashmir Affairs*, March 2008, www.kashmiraffairs.org/rifaat_hussain_pak_change_outlook_kashmir.html [accessed 24 March 2011].
7. Prannoy Roy, 'Pak ready to give up claim on Kashmir: Musharraf', *NDTV.com*, 5 December 2006, www.ndtv.com/convergence/ndtv/story.aspx?id=NEWEN20060000499# [accessed 20 May 2007].
8. Cloughley, *A History of the Pakistan Army*, p. 64.
9. 'Pakistan admits India attack link', *BBC News*, 12 February 2009, http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south_asia/7885261.stm [accessed 14 February 2009].
0. Robert W. Bradnock, *Kashmir: Paths to Peace*, London, Chatham House, 2010, p. 1.
1. Ibid., pp. 15, 16, 19.
2. Colin Irwin, *PaK v IaK: Getting beyond a referendum*, Peace Polls, University of Liverpool, 2009, www.peacepolls.org/peacepolls/documents/000648.pdf [accessed 24 December 2014], p. 2.
3. Bradnock, *Kashmir: Paths to Peace*, p. 30.
4. Khullar, *India: A Comprehensive Geography*, pp. 9, 11, states that J&K's area is 222,236 sq. km. This comprises 78,114 sq. km 'under illegal occupation of Pakistan', 5,180 sq. km 'illegally handed over by Pakistan to China', and 37,555 sq. km 'under illegal occupation of China in

Ladakh district’.

5. ‘Simla Agreement July 2, 1972’, *Kashmir Information Network*, www.kash-mir-information.com/LegalDocs/SimlaAgreement.html [accessed 12 December 2012].
6. See Snedden, *The Untold Story of the People of Azad Kashmir*, pp. 217–227.
7. Jawaharlal Nehru, ‘Let the People Decide’, Speech in Parliament, New Delhi, 7 August, 1952, in *Jawaharlal Nehru’s Speeches 1949–1953*, The Publications Division, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India, Delhi, 1954, p. 353.

CONCLUSION

1. *The Census of Azad Kashmir, 1951*, p. 12.
2. *Azad Kashmir at a Glance [2007]*, Muzaffarabad, Planning & Development Department, Azad Govt. of the State of Jammu & Kashmir, www.pndajk.gov.pk/ajk_glance2007.asp#DDSDAJK [accessed 19 March 2014].
3. *The Testament of Sheikh Abdullah*, p. 84.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abdullah, Sheikh Mohammad, *Flames of the Chinar*, [Khushwant Singh, Translator], New Delhi, Viking, 1993.
- ‘Abhinavagupta’, *Abhinavagupta.net*, <http://abhinavagupta.net/abhinavagupta.html> [accessed 25 January 2013].
- Administration Report of Jammu and Kashmir for the Year 1959–60 (1st April 1959–31st March 1960)*, Srinagar, Government of Jammu and Kashmir, 1961.
- , *1960–61 (1st April 1960–31st March 1961)*, Srinagar, Government of Jammu and Kashmir, 1962.
- , *1961–62 (1st April 1961–31st March 1962)*, Srinagar, Government of Jammu and Kashmir, 1963.
- , *2011 (13th April 1954–12th April 1955)*, [Srinagar?], Jammu and Kashmir Government, [1955?].
- , *2012 (1st April 1955–31st March 1956)*, [Srinagar?], Jammu and Kashmir Government, [1957?].
- , *S. 2005 (13th April 1948–12th April 1949)*, Jammu, Ranbir Government Press, 1951.
- , *S. 2006 (13th April 1949–12th April 1950)*, Jammu, Ranbir Government Press, 1952.
- Afzal, M. Rafique, Editor, *Selected Speeches and Statements of the Quaid-i-Azam Mohammad Ali Jinnah (1911–34 and 1947–48)*, Lahore, Research Society of Pakistan, University of the Punjab, 1966.
- , Editor, *Speeches and Statements of Quaid-i-Millat Liaquat Ali Khan (1941–51)*, Lahore, Research Society of Pakistan, University of the Punjab, 1967.
- Ahsan, Aitzaz, *The Indus Saga and the Making of Modern Pakistan*, Lahore, Nehru Ghar Publications, 2000, (first published by Oxford University Press, 1996).
- AJ&K Cabinet, *Azad Jammu & Kashmir* website, www.ajk.gov.pk/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=394&Itemid=15 [accessed 25 February 2014].
- Akbar, M.J., *Kashmir: Behind the Vale*, New Delhi, Viking, 1991.
- , *Nehru: The Making of India*, London, Penguin, 1989.
- Albinia, Alice, *Empires of the Indus: The Story of a River*, London, John Murray, 2008.
- Alexander, Horace, ‘India-Pakistan I’, *The Spectator*, London, Issue 180, 16 January 1948.
- Ali, Chaudhri Muhammad, *The Emergence of Pakistan*, New York, Columbia University Press, 1967.
- Allen, Charles, *God’s Terrorists, The Wahhabi Cult and the Hidden Roots of Modern Jihad*, London, Little, Brown, 2006.
- , *Soldier Sahibs*, London, Abacus, 2001.
- Allen, Charles and Sharada Dwivedi, *Lives of the Indian Princes*, London, Arena, 1984.
- Amin, Tahir, *Mass Resistance in Kashmir, Origins, Evolution, Options*, Islamabad, Institute of Policy Studies, 1995.
- ‘An Update on Gilgit-Baltistan Elections’, *The Researchers*, Islamabad, [2009?] www.theresearchers.org/Post&Update/Gilgit-Baltistan%20Elections.pdf [accessed 7 September 2014].

- Anand, Adarsh Sein, *The Constitution of Jammu & Kashmir. Its Development & Comments*, New Delhi, Universal Law Publishing, Third Edition, 1998, [First Edition, 1980].
- , *The Development of the Constitution of Jammu & Kashmir*, New Delhi, Light & Life, 1980.
- Anderson, Benedict, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, London, Verso, 1963.
- ‘Army, Police Turn Up Heat on Kashmir Militants’, *freepresskashmir*, 25 February 2014, <http://freepresskashmir.com/army-police-turn-up-heat-on-kashmir-militants-061825/> [accessed 26 February 2014].
- Article 34 and Article 35, ‘Chapter VI: Pacific Settlement of Disputes’, *Charter of the United Nations*, www.un.org/en/documents/charter/chapter6.shtml [accessed 24 March 2011].
- ‘Article 257, Provision relating to the State of Jammu and Kashmir, Part XII, Miscellaneous, Chapter 4. General’, The Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, www.pakistani.org/pakistan/constitution/part12.ch4.html [accessed 18 March 2009].
- Axmann, Martin, *Back to the Future: The Khanate of Kalat and the Genesis of Baloch Nationalism 1915–1955*, Karachi, Oxford University Press, 2012 [first published 2009].
- Axworthy, Michael, *A History of Iran: Empire of the Mind*, New York, Basic Books, 2008.
- Azad Kashmir at a Glance [2007]*, Muzaffarabad, Planning & Development Department, Azad Govt. of the State of Jammu & Kashmir, www.pndajk.gov.pk/ajk_glance2007.asp#DDSDAJK [accessed 19 March 2014].
- “‘Azad Kashmir’ is Neither Azad nor Kashmiri”, *Organiser*, Delhi, Volume 19, Number 7, 26 September 1965.
- Aziz, Mir Abdul, ‘Azad Kashmir Government: A Chronology’, *The Muslim*, Islamabad, 13 August 1996.
- Baid, Samuel, ‘Self-Determination for Kashmiris: A Camouflage for Pak’s [sic] Own Claim’, *Strategic Analysis*, Volume 13, Number 3, June 1990.
- Bakshi, S.R., *Kashmir: Political Problems*, New Delhi, Sarup & Sons, 1997.
- , *Kashmir Through Ages—4, Kashmir: Political Problems*, New Delhi, Sarup & Sons, 1997.
- , *Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah*, Jammu, Jay Kay Book House, 1995.
- Ballard, Roger, ‘Kashmir Crisis: View from Mirpur’, *Economic and Political Weekly*, Bombay, 2–9 March 1991.
- Bamzai, Prithivi Nath Kaul, *A History of Kashmir*, Delhi, Metropolitan Book Co., 1962.
- Banerji, J.N., *I Report on Kashmir*, Calcutta, The Republic Publications, [1948?].
- Bankeshwar, Sumanth S., *Conspiracy in Kashmir*, Bangalore, Society for Defence of Democracy, 1955.
- Bates, Charles Ellison, Compiler, *A Gazetteer of Kashmir*, Mirpur, Verinag Publishers, Reprinted [No Publication Date; First Published 1873?].
- Bazaz, Prem Nath, *Azad Kashmir: A Democratic Socialist Conception*, Mirpur, Verinag Publishers, 1992, [First Published by Ferozsons, Lahore, 1951].
- , *Democracy Through Intimidation and Terror: The Untold Story of Kashmir Politics*, New Delhi, Heritage, 1978.
- , *Inside Kashmir*, Mirpur, Verinag Publishers, 1987, [First Published by Kashmir Pub. [sic] Company, Srinagar, 1941].
- , *Kashmir in Crucible*, Mirpur, Verinag Publishers, 1991, [First Published by Pamposh Pubs [sic], New Delhi, 1967].

- , ‘Sheikh Abdullah, Kashmir and Indo-Pak Relations’, in Sharma, Usha, Editor, *Heritage of Jammu, Kashmir and Ladakh*, Volume 3, New Delhi, Radha Publications, 1996.
- , *The History of Struggle for Freedom in Kashmir*, Karachi, National Book Foundation, 1976, [First Published by Kashmir Pub [sic]. Company, New Delhi, 1954].
- , *Truth About Kashmir*, Delhi, The Kashmir Democratic Union, 1950.
- Bedi, B.P.L., and Bedi, Freda, *Sheikh Abdulla [sic]. His Life and Ideals*, Srinagar, [No Publisher Details], 1949.
- Beg, Aziz, *Captive Kashmir*, Lahore, Allied Business Corporation, 1957.
- Behera, Navnita Chadha, *Demystifying Kashmir*, Washington D.C., Brookings Institution Press, 2006.
- Bellew, H.W., *Kashmir and Kashgar*, London, Trubner and Co., 1875
- Bernier, Francis, ‘A Voyage to Kachemire, the Paradise of Indostan’, in Ros Ballaster, editor, *Fables of the East: Selected Tales 1662–1785*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Bhagotra, H.L., ‘Foreword’, in C.P. Gupta, *The Directory of Mirpur Mahajan Families Settled in Jammu*, Jammu, Mirpur Mahajan Sabha, 1997.
- Bharti, K.R., *Chamba Himalaya: Amazing Land, Unique Culture*, New Delhi, Indus Publishing Company, [2001].
- Bhat, Khawaja Sana-ullah, *Kashmir Testament*, [Altaf Hussain Tak, Translator], Delhi, Bright Publications, 1998.
- Bhatia, K.L., *Jammu and Kashmir: Article 370 of the Constitution of India*, New Delhi, Deep & Deep, 1997.
- Bhattacharjea, Ajit, *Kashmir. The Wounded Valley*, New Delhi, UBSPD, 1994.
- Bhushan, Vidya, *State Politics and Government: Jammu and Kashmir*, Jammu, Jay Kay Book House, 1985.
- Birdwood, Lord, *Two Nations and Kashmir*, London, Robert Hale, 1956.
- Bolitho, Hector, *Jinnah, Creator of Pakistan*, London, John Murray, 1954.
- Bose, Sumantra, *The Challenge in Kashmir. Democracy, Self-Determination and a Just Peace*, New Delhi, Sage Publications, 1997.
- Bradnock, Robert W., *Kashmir: Paths to Peace*, London, Chatham House, 2010.
- Brecher, Michael, *The Struggle for Kashmir*, New York, Oxford University Press, 1953.
- Brereton, J.M., ‘The Panjdeh Crisis, 1885’, *History Today*, 1 January 1979.
- Brock, R.W., *The Simon Report on India: An Abridgement*, London, J.M. Dent, 1930.
- Bukhari, Shujaat, ‘The other Kashmir’, *The Hindu*, 14 June 2011, www.the-hindu.com/opinion/op-ed/article2101764.ece [accessed 14 June 2011].
- Burnes, Lieut. Alexander, *Travels Into Bokhara*, London, Eland, 2012, Kathleen Hopkirk editor, [First published by John Murray, London 1835].
- ‘Bus service between Islamabad, Kashgar from August’ *Dawn*, <http://archives.dawn.com/2007/05/16/nat14.htm> [accessed 8 February 2013].
- Butt, Sanaullah, *Kashmir in Flames. An Untold Story of Kashmir’s Political Affairs*, Srinagar, Ali Mohammad & Sons, 1981.
- Candler, Edmund, *On the Edge of the World*, London, Cassell and Company, 1919.
- Census of Azad Kashmir, 1951*, [Murree?], Iftikhar Ahmad, Chief Enumeration Officer, Government of Azad Kashmir, [1952].
- Census of India 1941*, Volume XXII, *Jammu & Kashmir State*, Part III, *Village Tables*, Srinagar, R.G. Wreford, Editor, Jammu and Kashmir Government, 1942.
- Census of India 1961*, Volume VI, *Jammu and Kashmir*, Part I-A (i), *General Report*, M.H. Kamili,

- Superintendent of Census Operations Jammu and Kashmir, Srinagar, Census of India, 1968.
- Chagla, M.C., *Kashmir 1947–1965*, Delhi, Publications Division, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, 1965.
- Chand, Attar, *Islamic Nations and Kashmir Problem*, Delhi, Raj Publications, 1994.
- , *Pakistan Terrorism in Punjab & Kashmir*, Delhi, Amar Prakashan, [1993?].
- Chari, A.S.R., *The Kashmir Problem*, New Delhi, M. Kalimulla, 1965.
- Chopra, P.N., Chief Editor, *India's Struggle for Freedom: Role of Associated Movements*, Volume Four, Delhi, Agam Prakashan, 1985.
- , Chief Editor, *The Collected Works of Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel*, Delhi, Volume XII, Konark Publishers.
- Chopra, V.D. and Rasgotra M., Editors, *Genesis of Regional Conflicts: Kashmir, Afghanistan, West Asia, Cambodia, Chechnya*, New Delhi, Gyan Publishing, 1995.
- Civil & Military Gazette*, Lahore.
- Clark, William, 'A Journey to "Free Kashmir"', *The Listener*, Volume 51, 20 May 1954.
- Clinton, William J., 'Remarks at the One America Meeting With Religious Leaders', 9 March 2000, *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: WILLIAM J. CLINTON*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Book I, 2000, www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/PPP-2000-book1/html/PPP-2000-book1-doc-pg422.htm, [accessed 3 September 2014].
- Cloughley, Brian, *A History of the Pakistan Army*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, Second Edition, 2000.
- Cohen, Maurice, *Thunder over Kashmir*, Hyderabad, Orient Longman, 1955.
- Cohen, Stephen Phillip, *The Idea of Pakistan*, Lahore, Vanguard, 2005.
- , *The Indian Army*, Delhi, Oxford University Press, 1990.
- , *The Pakistan Army*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1984.
- Confidential U.S. State Department Central Files, India: Internal Affairs, 1945–1949, Part I, Political, Governmental, and National Defense Affairs*, Frederick, Maryland, University Publications of America, Reel Number 9.
- Constitutional Relations Between Britain and India, The Transfer of Power 1942–7*, London, Nicholas Mansergh, Editor-in-Chief, Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
- , Volume X, 22 March—30 May 1947, 1981;
- , Volume XI, 31 May—7 July 1947, 1982;
- , Volume XII, 8 July—15 August 1947, 1983.
- Contemporary South Asia*, Volume 4 [Kashmir Special Issue], Number 1, March 1995.
- Copland, Ian, 'Islam and Political Mobilization in Kashmir, 1931–34', *Pacific Affairs*, Volume 54, Number 2, 1981.
- , 'The Abdullah Factor: Kashmiri Muslims and the Crisis of 1947', in Low, D.A., Editor, *The Political Inheritance of Pakistan*, Houndmills, Macmillan, 1991.
- , 'The Princely States, the Muslim League, and the Partition of India in 1947', *The International History Review*, Volume XIII, Number 1, February 1991.
- , *The Princes in the Endgame of Empire, 1917–1947*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Coupland, R., *Indian Politics 1936–1942*, London, Oxford University Press, 1943.
- Coupland, Sir Reginald, *India: A Re-Statement*, London, Oxford University Press, 1945.
- Dalrymple, William, *Return of a King*, London, Bloomsbury, 2013.

- Dani, Ahmad Hasan, *History of Northern Areas of Pakistan*, Islamabad, National Institute of Historical and Cultural Research, 1991.
- Dar, Mohammad Ali, *Trade and Commerce During Dogra Rule in Kashmir (A.D. 1846–1947)*, Faridabad, Om Publications, 1999.
- Das, Durga, Editor, *Sardar Patel's Correspondence 1945–50, Volume I, New Light on Kashmir*, Ahmedabad, Navajivan Publishing House, 1971.
- Dasgupta, Anindita, 'Remembering Sylhet: A Forgotten Story of India's 1947 Partition', *Economic and Political Weekly*, 2 August 2008.
- Dawn*, New Delhi, then after relocation around September 1947, Karachi.
- Dawson, Pauline, *The Peacekeepers of Kashmir*, London, Hurst & Company, 1994.
- Defending Kashmir*, [Delhi], The Publications Division, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India, 1949.
- Deora, M.S. and R. Grover, Editors, *Documents on Kashmir Problem*, Volume X, New Delhi, Discovery Publishing House, 1991.
- De Mhaffe, A., *Road to Kashmir*, Lahore, Ripon Printing Press, [1948?].
- Dhar, S.N., *Kashmir: Eden of the East*, Allahabad, Kitab Mahal, [1945].
- Dhar, T.N. 'Kundan', 'Five Millennia Old Culture & Literature of Kashmir—Some Landmarks', 16 December 2000, *Kashmiri Overseas Association*, <http://koausa.org/culture/oldculture.html> [accessed 17 July 2012].
- Discord in Pakistan's Northern Areas*, International Crisis Group, Islamabad/ Brussels, Asia Report No. 131, 2 April 2007.
- 'District Profile[s], Jammu & Kashmir', *Census of India*, New Delhi, (Indian) Ministry of Home Affairs, 2011, various pages, accessible at www.censusindia.gov.in/Tables_Published/Basic_Data_Sheet.aspx [accessed 22 September 2012].
- Dixit, J.N., 'A Defining Moment', in editor unknown, *Guns and Yellow Roses: Essays on the Kargil War*, New Delhi, Harper and Collins, 1999.
- Doniger, Wendy, *The Hindus: An Alternative History*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Drew, Frederic, *The Jummoo and Kashmir Territories. A Geographical Account*, Delhi, Oriental Publishers, 1971, [First Published 1875?].
- Duke, Joshua, *Ince's Kashmir Handbook: A Guide for Visitors*, Calcutta, Thacker, Spink and Co., 1888.
- Dupree, Nancy Hatch, 'The Question of Jalalabad during the First Anglo-Afghan War', *Asian Affairs*, Vol. 6, No. 1, 1975.
- Durand, Colonel Algernon, *The Making of a Frontier: Five Years' Experiences and Adventures in Gilgit, Hunza, Nagar, Chitral, and the Eastern Hindu-Kush*, London, John Murray, 1899.
- Edwardes, Michael, *Raj: The Story of British India*, London, Pan, 1969.
- 'Fatalities in Terrorist Violence 1988—2014', *South Asia Terrorism Portal*, www.satp.org/satporgtp/countries/india/states/jandk/data_sheets/annual_casual-ties.htm [accessed 26 February 2014].
- Fazili, Manzoor, *Kashmir Government and Politics*, Srinagar, Gulshan Publishers, 1982.
- , Editor, *Kashmir Predilection*, Srinagar, Gulshan Publishers, 1988.
- Fazili, Manzoor A., *Socialist Ideas & Movements in Kashmir (1919–1947)*, New Delhi, Eureka Publications, 1980.
- Federal Government's Contribution to the Progress of Azad Kashmir*, Islamabad, Ministry of Information & Broadcasting, Government of Pakistan, [1976].

- Feigon, Lee, *Demystifying Tibet*, London, Profile Books, 2000.
- Final Award in the Matter of the Indus Waters Kishenganga Arbitration*, Permanent Court of Arbitration, The Hague, 20 December 2013.
- Fitchett, W.H., *The Tale of the Great Mutiny*, London, Smith, Elder and Co., 1911.
- ‘Foreign Ministry Spokesperson Liu Weimin’s Regular Press Conference on January 17, 2012’, *Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China*, 18 January 2012, www.fmprc.gov.cn/eng/xwfw/s2510/2511/t897133.htm [accessed 26 February 2012].
- ‘From the fringes: Gilgit-Baltistanis silently observe elections’, *Dawn*, 1 May 2013, www.dawn.com/news/794958/from-the-fringes-gilgit-baltistanis-silently-observe-elections [accessed 8 September 2014].
- Frontline*, Madras/ Chennai.
- Fuller, Graham E., *A World Without Islam*, New York, Back Bay Books, 2010.
- Ganai, Abdul Jabbar, *Kashmir and National Conference and Politics (1975–1980)*, Srinagar, Gulshan Publishers, 1984.
- Ganjoo, S.K., *Kashmir History and Politics*, New Delhi, Commonwealth Publications, 1998.
- Ganju, M., *This is Kashmir (With Special Reference to U.N.O.)*, Delhi, S. Chand & Co, [1948].
- Ganguly, Sumit, *The Crisis in Kashmir*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Garver, John W., ‘China’s Decision for War with India in 1962’, in Robert S. Ross and Alastair Iain Johnston, eds, *New Approaches to the Study of Chinese Foreign Policy*, Stanford University Press, 2005.
- , *Protracted Contest: Sino-Indian Rivalry in the Twentieth Century*, Seattle, University of Washington Press, 2001.
- Gazetteer of Kashmir and Ladak [sic]*, 1992 Delhi, Manas Publications [compiled under the direction of the Quarter Master General in India in the Intelligence Branch and first published in 1890, by the Superintendent of Government Printing, Calcutta].
- ‘Geelani opposes separate colonies for Kashmiri Pandits’, *Hindustan Times*, 2 July 2012, www.hindustantimes.com/India-news/Srinagar/Geelani-opposes-separate-colonies-for-Kashmiri-Pandits/Article1-882291.aspx [accessed 2 July 2012].
- Ghosh, Suchandra, ‘Understanding Transitions at the Crossroads of Asia: c. Mid Second Century B.C.E. to c. Third Century C.E.’, *Studies in History*, Vol. 23, No. 2, 2007.
- Gilani, Justice Syed Manzoor Hussain, *The Constitution of Azad Jammu & Kashmir (In the historical backdrop with corresponding Pakistan, India & Occupied Jammu and Kashmir Constitutions)*, Islamabad, National Book Foundation, 2008.
- Gilani, Syed Manzoor H., *Constitutional Development in Azad Jammu & Kashmir*, Lahore, National Book Depot, 1988.
- Gilgit-Baltistan at a Glance 2013*, Gilgit, Statistical Cell, Planning and development Department, Government of Gilgit-Baltistan, 2013?, www.gilgitbaltistan.gov.pk/DownloadFiles/GBFinancilCurve.pdf [accessed 28 January 2015].
- ‘Gilgit-Baltistan (Empowerment and Self-Governance) Order, 2009’, *Government of Gilgit-Baltistan*, www.gilgitbaltistan.gov.pk/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=65&Itemid=110 [accessed 7 March 2011].
- Giyas-Ud-Din, Peer, *Understanding The Kashmiri Insurgency*, New Delhi, Anmol Publications, 1992.
- Gopal, S., General Editor, *Selected Works of Jawaharlal Nehru*, Volume 3–6, New Delhi, Jawaharlal Nehru Memorial Fund, 1985–1987.

Government of India Act 1935, London, Parliament of the United Kingdom, 1935. ‘(Original version (as it was originally enacted)’ downloadable at www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/Geo5and1Edw8/26/2/enacted [accessed 22 March 2012].)

Grant, Bruce, *Gods and Politicians: Politics as Culture—An Australian View of India*, Ringwood, Penguin, 1984.

Griffiths, Mark, *The Lotus Quest*, London, Chattis & Windus, 2009.

Grover, Amar, ‘Postcard from ... Kashmir: Still a hotspot—but for the right reasons’, *Financial Times*, 3 February 2011, www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/2/9abef77e-4819-11e1-b1b4-00144feabdc0.html#axzz1lf489NCY [accessed 7 February 2011].

Gupta, Jyoti Bhusan Das, *Jammu and Kashmir*, The Hague, Martinus Nijhoff, 1968.

Gupta, Sisir, *Kashmir. A Study in India-Pakistan Relations*, Bombay, Asia Publishing House, 1966.

Gurmani, M.A., *Kashmir: A Survey*, [Rawalpindi?], Public Relations Directorate, Ministry of Kashmir, Government of Pakistan, [1952?].

Guruswamy, Mohan, ‘Real Estate vs Realpolitik’, *Outlook*, 12 April 1999, <http://m.outlookindia.com/story.aspx?sid=4&aid=207284> [accessed 30 November 2012].

Hafizullah, Mohd., *Towards Azad Kashmir*, Lahore, Bazam-i-Froghi-i-Adab, [1948].

‘Hafiz Saeed alleges India of “water terrorism”’, *Pakistan Today*, www.pakistan-today.com.pk/2014/09/10/national/hafiz-saeed-alleges-india-of-water-terrorism/.

Hardgrave, Robert L., Editor, ‘Kashmir 1947: Burdens of the Past, Options for the Future—Four Perspectives’, *Commonwealth & Comparative Politics*, Volume 36, Number 1, March 1998.

Hasan, Khalid, Editor, *Azadi. Kashmir Freedom Struggle 1924–1998*, Lahore, Printing Professionals, 1999.

Hasan, Sarwar K. and Zubeida Hasan, Editors, *Documents on the Foreign Relations of Pakistan. The Kashmir Question*, Karachi, Pakistan Institute of International Relations, 1966.

Hassnain, F.M., *Freedom Struggle in Kashmir*, New Delhi, Rima Publishing, 1988.

———, *Gilgit: The Northern Gate of India*, New Delhi, Sterling Publishers, 1975.

High Court of Judicature, Azad Jammu and Kashmir, *Verdict on Gilgit and Baltistan (Northern Area)*, Mirpur, Kashmir Human Rights Forum, [1993?].

Hodson, H.V., *The Great Divide*, London, Hutchinson, 1969.

Holmes, Richard, *Sahib: The British Soldier in India, 1750–1914*, London, Harper Perennial, 2006.

Hoodbhoy, Pervez, Editor, *Confronting the Bomb: Pakistani and Indian Scientists Speak Out*, Karachi, Oxford University Press, 2013.

Hopkirk, Peter, *Setting the East Ablaze*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1984 [reissued 2001].

———, *The Great Game: The Struggle for Empire in Central Asia*, New York, Kodansha International, 1992, [first published as *The Great Game: On Secret Service in High Asia* by John Murray, London, 1990].

Hussain, Ijaz, *Kashmir Dispute. An International Law Perspective*, Islamabad, Quaid-i-Azam University, 1998.

Hussain, Mirza Shafique, Compiler, *History of Kashmir: A Study in Documents 1916–1939*, Islamabad, National Institute of Historical and Cultural Research, 1992.

Husain, Ita’at, ‘The Ordeal of Kashmir’, *Pakistan Quarterly*, Volume 13, Number 2/3, Autumn/Winter 1965.

Hussain, Shafqat, ‘Small Players in the Great Game: Marginality and Representation on the Northern Frontiers of Nineteenth-Century Colonial India’, *South Asia: Journal of South Asian Studies*, Volume XXIX, No. 2, August 2006.

- Hussain, Syed Rifaat, 'Pakistan's Changing outlook on Kashmir', *Kashmir Affairs*, March 2008, www.kashmiraffairs.org/rifaat_hussain_pak_change_outlook_kashmir.html [accessed 24 March 2011].
- Hutchison, J., and Vogel, J. Ph., *History of the Panjab [sic] Hill States*, Himachal Pradesh, Department of Languages, 1982.
- Imrany, M.R., *Paradise Under the Shadow of Hell. India's War on Kashmir As Seen By Non-Muslims and Neutral Observers*, Lahore, [No Publisher Details], 1948.
- 'India welcomes exclusion of J&K from U.N. list', *The Hindu*, 15 November 2010.
- 'India', *The World Factbook*, Central Intelligence Agency, 26 March 2013, www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/in.html [accessed 6 April 2013].)
- Indian Independence Act 1947*, London, Parliament of the United Kingdom, 1947, www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/Geo6/10-11/30 [accessed 22 March 2013].
- Iqbal, S.M., Editor, *The Culture of Kashmir*, Karachi, Wahid Publications, 1991.
- Irfani, Suroosh, Editor, *Fifty Years of the Kashmir Dispute*, Muzaffarabad, University of Azad Jammu and Kashmir, 1997.
- Irwin, Colin, *PaK v IaK: Getting beyond a referendum*, Peace Polls, University of Liverpool, 2009, www.peacepolls.org/peacepolls/documents/000648.pdf [accessed 24 December 2014].
- Izzatullah, Shaikh, *Kashmir-Plebiscite*, Lahore, Iqbal Company, [1949?].
- Jacquemont, Victor, *Letters from India*, London, Edward Churton, 1834, Volume II, <https://play.google.com/books/reader?id=ugbqJnYQeFAC&printsec=frontcover&output=reader&authuser=0&hl=en&pg=GBS.RA1-PA1> [accessed 18 November 2012].
- , *Letters from India 1829-1832*, translated with an Introduction by Catherine Alison Phillips, London, Macmillan, 1936.
- Jagmohan, *My Frozen Turbulence in Kashmir*, New Delhi, Allied Publishers, Fifth and Updated Edition, 1996.
- Jain, Ajit Prasad, *Kashmir: What Really Happened*, Bombay, Jaico Publishing, 1972.
- Jaleel, Muzamil, "'It Was Not Our War'", in editor unknown, *Guns and Yellow Roses: Essays on the Kargil War*, New Delhi, Harper and Collins, 1999.
- James, Lawrence, *Raj: The Making and Unmaking of British India*, London, Abacus, 1997.
- Jammu & Kashmir 1947-50. An Account of activities of first three years of Sheikh Abdullah's Government, Jammu, [Government of Jammu and Kashmir?]*, The Ranbir Government Press, 1951.
- Jeffrey, Robin, Editor, *People, Princes and Paramount Power: Society and Politics in the Indian Princely States*, Delhi, Oxford University Press, 1978.
- Jehu, I.S., Editor, *The India and Pakistan Year Book 1948*, Bombay, Bennett, Coleman & Co., [1948].
- Jha, Prem Shankar, *Kashmir, 1947. Rival Versions of History*, Delhi, Oxford University Press, 1996.
- 'JK govt [sic] declares 2010 as "Visit Kashmir" year', *Deccan Herald*, 6 January 2010, www.deccanherald.com/content/45240/jk-govt-declares-2010-visit.html [accessed 26 March 2011].
- 'JKLF rejects Musharraf's proposals for Kashmir solution', *Daily Times*, 7 August 2007, www.dailytimes.com.pk/default.asp?page=2007\08\07\story_7-8-2007_pg7_43 [accessed 10 August 2007].
- 'J-K Civil Secretariat to reopen in Jammu on Nov 8', *Indian Express*,

[accessed 15 March 2011].

- Kadian, Rajesh, *The Kashmir Tangle*, New Delhi, Vision Books, 1992.
- Kak, B.L., *Kashmir: Problems and Politics*, Delhi, Seema Publications, 1981.
- Kalhana's Rajatarangini, A Chronicle of the Kings of Kasmir* [sic], [M.A. Stein, Translator], Mirpur, Verinag Publishers, 1991, [First Published by M/s A. Constable & Co., London, 1900].
- Kalla, K.L., *Cultural Heritage of Kashmir*, New Delhi, Anmol Publications, 1996.
- Kapoor, O.P., *Kashmir Convictions Betrayed. Legacies of Abdullah-Nehru Nexus*, Chandigarh, Arun Publishing House, 1995.
- Kapur, M.L., *History and Culture of Kashmir*, Jammu, Kashmir History Publications, 1976.
- , *History of Jammu and Kashmir State, Volume I, The Making of the State*, Jammu, Kashmir History Publications, 1980.
- Kapur, M.L., Editor, *Maharaja Hari Singh (1895–1961)*, New Delhi, Har-Anand Publications, 1995.
- Karim, Afsir, and the Indian Defence Review Team, *Kashmir. The Troubled Frontiers*, New Delhi, Lancer Publishers, 1994.
- Kashmir Before Accession*, Lahore, [No Publisher Details, [Printed by the Superintendent, Government Printing, West Punjab]], 1948.
- Kashmir Demands Self-Determination. Extracts from Sheikh Abdullah's speeches, as reported by the Indian Press and Foreign News Agencies*, Muzaffarabad, Kashmir Publications, 1964.
- Kashmir in [the] Security Council*, Srinagar, Lalla Rookh Publications, [1953].
- Kashmir Slides Into Slavery. India Defies United Nations*, Muzaffarabad, Kashmir Publications, 1965.
- 'Kashmir survives another tragedy', *The Peninsula*, 2 July 2012, www.thepeninsulaqatar.com/india/199579-kashmir-survives-another-tragedy.html [accessed 13 July 2012].
- 'Kashmir—A Statistical Survey', in Sharma, Suresh K., and Bakshi, S.R., Editors, *Encyclopedia of Kashmir*, Volume 10, *Economic Life of Kashmir*, New Delhi, Anmol Publications, 1995.
- Kashmir (August 7—September 17, 1953)*, New Delhi, Current Affairs Publications, [1954].
- Kashmir's Fight for Freedom*, [Washington], Dept. of Public Relations, Azad Kashmir Government, [1948].
- Kaul, H.N., 'The Azad Kashmir Cauldron', *Kashmir Today*, Volume 6, Number 2, March 1962.
- Kaul, Pyarelal, *Crisis in Kashmir*, Srinagar, Heritage, 1991.
- Kaul, R.N., *Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah: A Political Phoenix*, New Delhi, Sterling Publishers, 1985.
- Kaul, Santosh, *Freedom Struggle in Jammu & Kashmir*, New Delhi, Anmol Publications, 1990.
- Keay, John, *Eccentric Travellers*, London, John Murray, 1982.
- , *The Gilgit Game*, London, John Murray, 1979.
- , *When Men and Mountains Meet: The Explorers of the Western Himalayas 1820–75*, Karachi, Oxford University Press, 1977.
- Keesing's Contemporary Archives*, London, Longman, Volume VI (1947).
- Kersten, Holger, *Jesus Lived in India*, London, Element, 1986.
- Keys to Kashmir*, Srinagar, Lalla Rookh, 1957.
- Khan, Amanullah, *Free Kashmir*, [No Publisher Details], 1970.
- Khan, F. M. (edited by Habib R. Sulemani), *The Story of Gilgit Baltistan and Chitral*, Gilgit, Eejaz Literary Agents & Publishers, 2002.
- Khan, G.H., *Freedom Movement in Kashmir 1931–1940*, New Delhi, Light & Life, 1980.

- Khan, Mohammad Ishaq, *History of Srinagar 1846–1947. A study in Socio-Cultural Change*, Srinagar, Aamir Publications, 1978.
- , ‘Kashmiri Muslims: Social and Identity Consciousness’, *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and Middle East*, Volume XVI, Number 2, 1996.
- , ‘Kashmiri Response to Islam (A.D. 1320–1586)’, *Islamic Culture*, Volume 61, Number 1, January 1987.
- , *Kashmir’s Transition to Islam: The Role of Muslim Rishis*, New Delhi, Manohar, 1994.
- , *Perspectives on Kashmir: Historical Dimensions*, Srinagar, Gulshan Publishers, 1983.
- , ‘The Significance of the Dargah of Hazratbal in the Socio-Religious and Political Life of Kashmiri Muslims’, in Troll, Christian W., Editor, *Muslim Shrines in India*, Delhi, Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Khan, Mohd Aslma, Rahmat Ali, Sheikh Mohd Sadiq and Inayat Ullah Khan, *Now or Never: Are We to Live or Perish forever?*, 28th January 1933, no original publication details, copy available at www.mediamonitors.net/nowornever.html [accessed 17 July 2012].
- Khan, Major-General (Retired) Muhammad Akbar, *Raiders in Kashmir*, Lahore, Jang Publishers, 1992.
- Khan, Muhammad Ayub, *Friends Not Masters. A Political Autobiography*, London, Oxford University Press, 1967.
- Khan, Raja Abbas, *Real Azad Kashmir*, Srinagar, Anu Kashmir Publications, 1969.
- Khan, Sardar M. Ibrahim, *The Kashmir Saga*, Lahore, Ripon Printing Press, 1965.
- , Mirpur, Verinag Publishers, Second Edition, 1990.
- Khan, Sardar Muhammad Abdul Qayyum, *In Search of Freedom*, Volume I, [No Publication Details], [1994?].
- , *The Kashmir Case*, [Rawalpindi?], [Al-Mujahid Academy?], 1992.
- Khan, Zulfqar, and Rizwana Abbasi, ‘Regional-centric Deterrence: Reassessing its Efficacy for South Asia’, *The Korean Journal of Defense Analysis*, Vol. 25, no. 4, December 2013.
- Khattak, Masood-Ur-Rehman, ‘Indian Strategic Thinking: A Reflection Of Kautilya’s Six Fold Policy —Analysis’, *Eurasia Review*, 30 March 2011, www.eurasiareview.com/indian-strategic-thinking-a-reflection-of-kautilyas-six-fold-policy-analysis-29032011/?utm_source=feedburner&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=Feed%3A+eurasiareview%2FVsnl [accessed 30 March 2011].
- Khullar, D.R., *India: A Comprehensive Geography*, Ludhiana, Kalyani Publishers, Second Edition, 2006.
- Kira, Altaf Hussain, *Cross-LoC trade in Kashmir: From Line of Control to Line of Commerce*, Mumbai, Indira Gandhi Institute of Development Research, 2011 www.igidr.ac.in/pdf/publication/WP-2011-020.pdf [accessed 28 February 2014].
- Knight, E.F., *Where Three Empires Meet*, London, Longmans, 1895.
- Knowles, J. Hinton, *A Dictionary of Kashmiri Proverbs & Sayings*, New Delhi, Asian Educational Services, 1985, [First Published 1885; No Publication Details].
- Korbel, Josef, *Danger in Kashmir*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, Revised Edition, 1966 [First Edition, 1954].
- , ‘The Kashmir Dispute After Six Years’, *International Organization*, Volume 7, Number 4, November 1953.
- Koul, Mohan Lal, *Kashmir: Past and Present. Unravelling the Mystique*, New Delhi, Manav

- Publications, 1994.
- Koul, Pandit Anand, *Geography of the Jammu and Kashmir State*, Verinag Publishers, Mirpur, 1991 [Reprint of the Second Edition, 1925].
- Kumar, Dinesh, 'Pakistan's proxy war in Kashmir is no longer a secret', *The Times of India*, 21 July 1998, www.timesofindia.com/210798/21edit12.htm.
- Kumar, D.P., *Kashmir: Pakistan's Proxy War*, New Delhi, Har-Anand Publications, [1996?].
- Lakhanpal, P.L., *Essential Documents and Notes on Kashmir Dispute*, Delhi, International Books, Second Edition, 1965.
- Lal, Lala Ganeshi, *Siyahat-i-Kashmir (Kashmir Nama or Tarikh-i-Kashmir), being An Account of a Journey to Kashmir, March–June 1846*, Translated into English and Annotated by Vidya Sagar Suri, 1954, [Simla?], The Punjab Government, 1955.
- Lamb, Alastair, *Kashmir, A Disputed Legacy, 1846–1990*, Karachi, Oxford University Press, Second Impression, 1994.
- , *Incomplete Partition: The Genesis of the Kashmir Dispute 1947–1948*, Hertingfordbury, Roxford Books, 1997.
- Lawrence, Walter R., *Provincial Gazetteers of Kashmir and Jammu*, New Delhi, Rima Publishing, 1985, [First Published 1905?].
- , *The Valley of Kashmir*, London, Henry Frowde, Oxford University Press Warehouse, 1895.
- Loyn, David, *Butcher and Bolt*, London, Windmill Books, 2009.
- Lyon, Peter, 'Kashmir', *International Relations: Journal of David Davies Memorial Institute of International Studies*, Volume 3, Number 2, October 1966.
- Macintyre, Ben, *Josiah the Great, The True Story of the Man Who Would Be King*, London, Harper Perennial, 2004.
- Maclean, Fitzroy, *A Person from England*, London, Readers Union Jonathan Cape, 1959.
- MacMunn, Lieut.-General Sir George, *The Indian States and Princes*, London, Jarrolds, 1936.
- Madhok, Bal Raj, *Jammu Kashmir and Ladakh. Problem & Solution*, New Delhi, Reliance Publishing, 1987.
- Mahajan, Mehr Chand, *Looking Back*, New Delhi, Har-Anand Publications, 1994, [First Published 1963?].
- Majumder, Sanjoy, 'Economist accuses India of censorship over Kashmir map', *BBC*, 24 May 2011, www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-south-asia-13529512 [accessed 1 December 2012].
- Malhotra, Inder, 'Immoveable objects', *Indian Express*, www.indianexpress.com/news/immovable-objects/575870/0 [accessed 20 February 2011].
- Malik, Iftikhar H, 'Kashmir Dispute: A Stalemate or Solution?', *Journal of South Asian and Middle Eastern Studies*, Volume 16, Number 4, Summer 1993.
- Manor, James, 'The Demise of Princely Order: A Reassessment', in Robin Jeffrey, Editor, *People, Princes and Paramount Power: Society and Politics in the Indian Princely States*, Delhi, Oxford University Press, 1978.
- Martin, Kingsley, 'As Pakistan Sees It', *New Statesman and Nation*, London, Issue 35, 6 March 1948.
- Matthews, Roderick, *The Flaws in the Jewel*, Noida, Harper Collins, 2010.
- Maxwell, Neville, *India's China War*, London, Jonathon Cape, 1970.
- McGarr, Paul M., 'After Nehru, What? Britain, the United States, and the Other Transfer of Power in India, 1960–64', *The International History Review*, Vol. 33, No. 1, March 2011.
- Memoranda on the Indian States 1940*, Delhi, The Manager of [Indian Government] Publications,

1940.

- Menon, V.P., *The Story of the Integration of the Indian States*, Bombay, Orient Longman, 1961.
- Messervy, General Sir Frank, 'Kashmir', *Asiatic Review*, Volume 45, Number 161, 1949.
- Metcalf, Barbara D. and Thomas R. Metcalf, *A Concise History of India*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Mirani, Haroon, 'Holy row in Kashmir over "Jesus tomb"', *Asia Times Online*, 22 May 2010, www.atimes.com/atimes/South_Asia/LE22Df03.html [accessed 1 February 2012].
- Mitra, Subrata K., 'Nehru's Policy Towards Kashmir: Bringing Politics Back in Again', *The Journal of Commonwealth and Comparative Politics*, Volume 35, Number 2, July 1997.
- 'Mr. Jinnah's presidential address to the Constituent Assembly of Pakistan, August 11, 1947', pakistani.org, www.pakistani.org/pakistan/legislation/constituent_address_11aug1947.html [accessed 24 June 2009].
- 'Musharraf thinks out-of-box to resolve Kashmir', *The Financial Express*, 26 January 2006.
- Najar, G.R., *Kashmir Accord (1975). A Political Analysis*, Srinagar, Gulshan Publishers, 1988.
- Naqash, Nasir A., and Shah, G.M., *Kashmir: From Crisis to Crisis*, New Delhi, APH Publishing House, 1997.
- Navlakha, Gautam, 'Invoking Union: Kashmir and Official Nationalism of "Bharat"', in Sathyamurthy, T.V., *Region, Religion, Caste, Gender and Culture in Contemporary India*, Delhi, Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Nayar, Kuldip, 'What Constitutes Kashmir?', *Radical Humanist*, New Delhi, Volume 57, Number 10, January 1994.
- Nehru, Jawaharlal, *India's Foreign Policy, Selected Speeches, September 1946—April 1961*, [New Delhi], Publications Division, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India, 1961.
- , 'Let the People Decide', Speech in Parliament, New Delhi, 7 August, 1952, in *Jawaharlal Nehru's Speeches 1949–1953*, The Publications Division, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India, Delhi, 1954.
- Nehru, Pandit Jawaharlal, 'Introductory Essay on Kashmir', in Dhar, S.N., *Kashmir: Eden of the East*, Allahabad, Kitab Mahal, [1945].
- Neve, Arthur, *Thirty Years in Kashmir*, London, Edwin Arnold, 1913.
- Neve, Dr E.F., *The Tourists Guide to Kashmir, Ladakh, Skardo &c*, Lahore, The Civil and Military Gazette Press, 1920, 12th Edition.
- Newberg, Paula R, *Double Betrayal. Repression and Insurgency in Kashmir*, Washington, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1995.
- New York Times*, New York.
- Noorani, A.G., *The Kashmir Question*, Bombay, Manaktalas, 1964.
- , 'Unravelling history', *Frontline*, Volume 30, Issue 1, 12–25 January 2013.
- Nund Rishi. *Unity in Diversity*, [B.N. Parimoo, Translator], Srinagar, J&K Academy of Art, Culture and Languages, 1984.
- 'Pakistan Administrative', *Ministry of Kashmir Affairs and Gilgit-Baltistan*, www.kana.gov.pk and follow link to 'Media', then 'Events', then 'Map of Pakistan' [accessed 3 January 2013].
- 'Pakistan admits India attack link', *BBC News*, 12 February 2009, http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south_asia/7885261.stm [accessed 14 February 2009].
- Pakistan Ministry of Foreign Affairs' maps, (Pakistan) Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 'Pakistan Administrative', www.mofa.gov.pk/Maps/PAK_Administrative.jpg, and 'Pakistan',

- www.mofa.gov.pk/Maps/Pak_Map.jpg [both accessed 17 February 2011].
- ‘Pakistan is Always Seen as the Rogue: SPIEGEL Interview with Pervez Musharraf (Interview conducted by Susanne Koelbl)’, *Spiegel*, 4 October 2010, www.spiegel.de/international/world/0,1518,721110,00.html [accessed 6 October 2010].
- ‘Pakistan Rejects the Indian Protest on Gilgit-Baltistan, the Self Rule Order,’ (*Pakistan*) *Ministry of Foreign Affairs*, www.mofa.gov.pk/press_releases/2009/Sep/PR_347_09.htm [accessed 6 March 2011].
- ‘Pakistan’, *The World Factbook*, Central Intelligence Agency, 1 April 2013, www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/pk.html [accessed 6 April 2013].
- Pandit, M. Amin, *Festivals of Kashmir*, Srinagar, Gulshan Publishers, 1997.
- Pandita, Rahul, *Our Moon Has Blood Clots: The Exodus of the Kashmiri Pandits*, Random House India, Noida, 2013.
- Panikkar, K.M., *Gulab Singh*, London, Martin Hopkinson, 1930.
- , *Indian States*, [Bombay], Oxford University Press, Second Edition, 1943.
- , *The Founding of the Kashmir State. A Biography of Maharaja Gulab Singh, 1792–1858*, London, George Allen & Unwin, 1953.
- Pant, Kusum, *The Kashmiri Pandit. Story of a Community in Exile in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*, New Delhi, Allied Publishers, 1987.
- PCA Press Release, Indus Waters Kishenganga Arbitration (Pakistan V. India)*, Permanent Court of Arbitration, The Hague, 21 December 2013.
- Pirzada, Syed Sharifuddin, *Foundations of Pakistan. All-India Muslim League Documents: 1906–1947*, New Delhi, Metropolitan Book Co., 1982.
- Pithawalla, Maneck B., *An Introduction to Kashmir. Its Geology and Geography*, Muzaffarabad, Kashmir Publications, 1953.
- Poplai, S.L., Editor, *India: 1947–50, Volume I, Internal Affairs*, London, Oxford University Press, 1959.
- ‘Population Estimates’, *United Nations Statistics Division*, [2012?], footnotes 53 and 75, http://unstats.un.org/unsd/mbs/data_files/t01.pdf [accessed 26 October 2012].
- Prakash, Siddhartha, ‘The Political Economy of Kashmir Since 1947’, *Contemporary South Asia*, Volume 9, Number 3, 2000.
- Prasad S.N., and Pal, Dharm, *History of Operations in Jammu and Kashmir (1947–48)*, Delhi, History Division, Ministry of Defence, Government of India, 1987.
- Preston, Diana and Michael, *Taj Mahal*, New York, Walker & Company, 2007.
- Prophet, Elizabeth Clare, *The Lost Years of Jesus: Documentary Evidence of Jesus’ 17-Year Journey to the East*, 1987, Gardiner, Summit University Press.
- Punjabi, Riyaz, ‘Kashmiriyat: The Mystique of an Ethnicity’, *Indian International Centre Quarterly*, Volume 17, Number 2, 1990.
- Puri, Balraj, *Jammu and Kashmir. Triumph and Tragedy of Indian Federalisation*, New Delhi, Sterling Publishers, 1981.
- , *Jammu—A Clue to the Kashmir Triangle*, Delhi, Balraj Puri, 1966.
- , *Kashmir: Towards Insurgency*, New Delhi, Orient Longman, 1993.
- , *Simmering Volcano. Study of Jammu’s Relations with Kashmir*, New Delhi, Sterling Publishers, 1983.
- , Editor, *5000 Years of Kashmir*, Delhi, Ajanta Publications, 1997.

- Puri, Luv, *Across the Line of Control: Inside Pakistan-Administered Jammu and Kashmir*, New York, Columbia University Press, 2012.
- Qadri, Afzal S.M., Editor, *Cultural Heritage of Kashmir*, Srinagar, University of Kashmir, 1997.
- Qasim, Mir, *My Life and Times*, New Delhi, Allied Publishers, 1992.
- Quraishi, Zaheer Masood, *Elections & State Politics of India (A Case-Study of Kashmir)*, Delhi, Sundeep Prakashan, 1979.
- Rahman, Mushtaqur, *Divided Kashmir: Old Problems, New Opportunities for India, Pakistan and the Kashmiri People*, Boulder, Lynne Rienner, 1996.
- Rai, Mridu, *Hindu Rulers, Muslim Subjects: Islam, Rights and the History of Kashmir*, London, Hurst and Co., 2004.
- Raina, Dina Nath, *Unhappy Kashmir. The Hidden Story*, New Delhi, Reliance Publishing, 1990.
- Raina, N.N., *Kashmir Politics and Imperialist Manoeuvres 1846–1980*, New Delhi, Patriot Publishers, 1988.
- Rashid, Rao A., *The Smiling Face of Azad Kashmir*, Karachi, Din Muhammadi Press, 1963.
- Ramzan, Beelam, 'MFN status—delayed or denied?', *The News*, 7 January 2013, www.thenews.com.pk/Todays-News-9-152954-MFN-status--delayed-or-denied [accessed 7 January 2013].
- Ray, Hemen, *How Moscow Sees Kashmir*, Bombay, Jaico Publishing, 1985.
- Raza, Maroof, *Wars and No Peace Over Kashmir*, New Delhi, Lancer Publishers, 1996.
- Reidel, Bruce, *Avoiding Armageddon: America, India, and Pakistan to the Brink and Back*, Washington D.C., The Brookings Institution, 2013, p. 197.
- 'Report submitted by the United Nations Representative for India and Pakistan, Sir Owen Dixon, to the Security Council, 15 September 1950', in Sarwar K. Hasan and Zubeida Hasan, Editors, *Documents on the Foreign Relations of Pakistan. The Kashmir Question*, Karachi, Pakistan Institute of International Relations, 1966.
- 'Resolution 39: The India-Pakistan Question (20 Jan)', *United Nations Security Council Resolutions—1948*, www.un.org/documents/sc/res/1948/scres48.htm [accessed 15 August 2003].
- 'Resolution 47: The India–Pakistan Question (21 Apr)', *United Nations Security Council Resolutions—1948*, www.un.org/documents/sc/res/1948/scres48.htm [accessed 15 August 2003].
- Riaz, Raja, 'The road to ruling Muzaffarabad passes through Islamabad', *Daily Times*, 28 July 2010.
- Richards, D.S., *The Savage Frontier*, London, Pan Books, 1990.
- Roberts, C.E. Bechhofer, *The Mr. A Case*, London, Jarrolds, [1950].
- Roy, Prannoy, 'Pak ready to give up claim on Kashmir: Musharraf', *NDTV.com*, 5 December 2006, www.ndtv.com/convergence/ndtv/story.aspx?id=NEWEN20060000499# [accessed 20 May 2007].
- Rushbrook Williams, L. F., *The State of Pakistan*, London, Faber and Faber, Second (Revised) Edition, 1966.
- Saraf, Muhammad Yusuf, *Kashmiris Fight—For Freedom*, Volume II (1947–1978), Lahore, Ferozsons, 1979.
- Saraf, Mulk Raj, Editor-in-Chief, *The Jammu and Kashmir Year Book and Who's Who 1977*, Jammu, Ranbir Publications, [1978?].
- Sahni, J.N., *The Kashmir Problem*, New Delhi, The Foreign Relations Society of India, 1951.
- Samad, Yunus, *A Nation in Turmoil. Nationalism and Ethnicity in Pakistan, 1937–1958*, New Delhi, Sage Publications, 1995.
- Sarabhai, Mridula, *Letters from Constitution House*, Muzaffarabad, Kashmir Publications, [1957?].

- Sarila, Narendra Singh, *The Shadow of the Great Game: the Untold Story of India's Partition*, London, Constable, 2007.
- Saxena, H.L., *The Tragedy of Kashmir*, New Delhi, Nationalist Publishers, 1975.
- Sayeed, Khalid B., *The Political System of Pakistan*, Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1967.
- Schofield, Victoria, *Kashmir in the Crossfire*, London, I.B. Tauris, 1996.
- , *Wavell: Soldier & Statesman*, Barnsley, Pen & Sword Military, 2010 [first published by John Murray, (Publishers) 2006].
- Schomberg, R.C.F., *Between the Oxus and the Indus*, London, Martin Hopkinson, 1935.
- Schwartzberg, J.E., 'Who are the Kashmiri People? Self-identification as a Vehicle for Self-determination', *Environment and Planning A*, Volume 29, 1997.
- 'Security Council Resolution 307 (1971) (of 21 December 1971)', <http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/RESOLUTION/GEN/NR0/261/67/IMG/NR026167.pdf?OpenElement> [accessed 23 February 2011].
- Sehgal, Narendra, *Converted Kashmir*, Delhi, Utpal Publications, 1994.
- Seminar: the Monthly Symposium*, New Delhi, Issue Number 392 [Titled 'Kashmir Today, a Symposium on a Troubled State'], April 1992.
- , Issue Number 496 [Titled 'Frameworks for Peace: a Symposium on Efforts to Broker Peace in Kashmir'], December 2000.
- Sen, Lt. General L.P., *Slender was the Thread*, Hyderabad, Orient Longman, 1988 [First Published 1969].
- Shah, Ghulam Hassan, *State Politics in India (Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah Voted to Power)*, Delhi, Independent Publishing, 1989.
- Shah, Mehtab Ali, 'The Kashmir Problem: a View from Four Provinces of Pakistan', *Contemporary South Asia*, Volume 4, Number 1, March 1995.
- Shahabuddin, Syed, 'Cutting the Gordian Knot Over Kashmir. An Imperative for the Sub-Continent', *Politics India*, Volume 1, Number 6, December 1996.
- Sharma, B.L., *Kashmir Awakes*, Delhi, Vikas Publications, 1971.
- Sharma, P.N., *Inside Pak Occupied Kashmir*, New Delhi, Delhi Press, [1958?].
- Sharma, Suresh K., and Bakshi, S.R., Editors, *Encyclopedia of Kashmir*, Ten Volumes, New Delhi, Anmol Publications, 1995.
- Sharma, Usha, Editor, *Heritage of Jammu, Kashmir and Ladakh*, Five Volumes, New Delhi, Radha Publications, 1996.
- Sher-i-Jang, Lieut. Col. (Retd.) M.A. Haq Mirza, *The Withering Chinar*, Islamabad, Institute of Policy Studies, [1991?].
- Siddiqi, Ayesha, *Military Inc. Inside Pakistan's Military Economy*, Karachi, Oxford University Press, 2007.
- 'Simla Agreement July 2, 1972', *Kashmir Information Network*, www.kashmir-information.com/LegalDocs/SimlaAgreement.html [accessed 12 December 2012].
- Singh, Balbir, *State Politics in India. Explorations in Political Processes in Jammu and Kashmir*, New Delhi, Macmillan, 1982.
- Singh, Bawa Satinder, *The Jammu Fox*, Carbondale, Southern Illinois University Press, 1974.
- Singh, Jaswant, *Jammu and Kashmir. Political and Constitutional Development*, New Delhi, Har-Anand Publications, 1996.
- Singh, Karan, *Autobiography*, Delhi, Oxford University Press, 1994.
- , [Sadar-i-Riyasat], *Selected Writings and Speeches, 1960–1964*, [Srinagar], Directorate of

- Information, Jammu and Kashmir Government, 1964.
- , ‘Why Kashmir? An Answer to the Critics’, in Atthar, Rashida, compiler, *Viewpoint. Editorial-page Articles from the ‘Times of India’*, Bombay, *The Times of India*, 1992.
- Singh, Major K. Brahma, *History of Jammu and Kashmir Rifles 1820–1956*, New Delhi, Lancer International, 1990.
- Singh, Narinder, *Political Awakening in Kashmir*, Delhi, H.K. Publications, 1992.
- Singh, Nirmal K., *Inter-Communal Relations in Jammu & Kashmir (1846 to 1931)*, Jammu, Jay Kay Book House, 1991.
- Singh, Patwant and Jyoti M. Rai, *Empire of the Sikhs: The Life and Times of Maharaja Ranjit Singh*, London, Peter Owen Publishers, 2008.
- Singh, Priyanka, *Gilgit Baltistan: Between Hope and Despair*, New Delhi, Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses, 2013.
- Singh, Raghubir, *Kashmir. Garden of the Himalayas*, [London], Thames and Hudson, 1983.
- Singh, Tavleen, *Kashmir. A Tragedy of Errors*, New Delhi, Viking, 1995.
- Skrine, C.P., *Chinese Central Asia*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1986 [first published by Methuen and Co., London, 1926].
- Skrine, C. P. and Pamela Nightingale, *Macartney at Kashgar: New Light on British, Chinese and Russian Activities in Sinkiang, 1890–1918*, Hong Kong, Oxford University Press, 1987.
- smartraveller.gov.au, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, www.smartravel-ler.gov.au/zw-cgi/view/Advice/India [accessed 31 January 2013].
- Snedden, Christopher, ‘A LOC-al affair—and India lacks a covert capability for use against P a k i s t a n ’, *South Asia Marsala*, 25 January 2013, <http://asiapacific.anu.edu.au/blogs/southasiamasala/2013/01/25/a-loc-al-affair-and-india-lacks-a-covert-capability-for-use-against-pakistan/> [accessed 30 January 2013].
- , ‘Kashmir: Placating frustrated people’, in Edward Aspinall, Robin Jeffrey and Anthony Regan, editors, *Diminishing Conflicts in Asia and the Pacific: Why some subside and others don’t*, London, Routledge, 2013.
- , *The Untold Story of the People of Azad Kashmir*, London, Hurst and Co., 2012 (republished by Oxford University Press, Karachi, 2013, and by Harper Collins, New Delhi, 2013, as *Kashmir: The Unwritten History*).
- , ‘What Happened to Muslims in Jammu? Local identity, the “Massacre” of 1947 and the Roots of the Kashmir “Problem”’, *South Asia: Journal of South Asian Studies*, Vol. XXIV, no. 2, 2001.
- , ‘Would a Plebiscite Have Resolved the Kashmir Dispute?’, *South Asia: Journal of South Asian Studies*, Vol. XXVIII, no. 1, April 2005.
- Spate, O.H.K., *India and Pakistan. A General and Regional Geography*, London, Methuen & Co., 1954.
- Spate, O.H.K. and A.T.A. Learmonth, *India and Pakistan. A General and Regional Geography*, [London?], Methuen, Revised Third Edition, 1967.
- Spear, Percival, editor, *The Oxford History of India*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1981, Fourth Edition.
- State Earthquake Reconstruction & Rehabilitation Agency (SERRA), Govt. of AJ&K, [sic] 2006, unpublished handout, copy obtained by author in Azad Kashmir in December 2006.
- Stephens, Ian, *Horned Moon. An Account of a Journey through Pakistan, Kashmir, and Afghanistan*, London, Chatto & Windus, 1953.

- , *Pakistan*, London, Ernest Benn, Second (Revised) Edition, 1964.
- Struggle for the Right of Self Determination*, [Mirpur], Jammu [sic] Kashmir Liberation League, [1998].
- Subohi, Afshan, 'Workers' remittances build a new city', *Dawn*, 23 February 2009.
- Sufi, G.M.D., *Kashir [sic]. Being a History of Kashmir From the Earliest Times to Our Own*.
 ———, Volume I, Lahore, The University of the Punjab, 1948;
 ———, Volume II, Lahore, The University of the Punjab, 1949.
- Suharwardy, A.H., *Kashmir. The Incredible Freedom-Fight*, Lahore, Jang Publishers, 1991.
- , *Tragedy in Kashmir*, Lahore, Wajidalis, 1983.
- Survey of India, [Map of] *Jamoo, [sic] Kashmir and Adjacent Districts*, Calcutta, Surveyor General's Office, 1861.
- Swami, Praveen, *The Kargil War*, New Delhi, LeftWord Books, Revised Edition, 2000.
- Symonds, Richard, *The Making of Pakistan*, London, Faber and Faber, 1950.
- , 'With the Rebel Forces of Poonch', *The Statesman*, Calcutta, 4 February 1948.
- S/1996/603*, 22 August 1996, *United Nations Security Council*, <http://domino.un.org/UNISPAL.NSF/3822b5e39951876a85256b6e0058a478/c0924183a7f95851> [accessed 18 July 2007]
- S/1996/704, 29 August 1996, *United Nations Security Council*, <http://daccess-dds.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N96/223/44/PDF/N9622344.pdf?OpenElement> [accessed 18 July 2007].
- S/ 2010/10: Summary statement by the Secretary-General on matters of which the Security Council is seized and on the stage reached in their consideration', *United Nations*, 21 January 2010, <http://unispal.un.org/UNISPAL.NSF/53936ddf3dd093a1852575530073f2e6/3bba5b8a0fd92a678OpenDocument> [accessed 29 March 2011].
- Talbot, Ian, *Pakistan: A Modern History*, London, Hurst & Company, 1998.
- Tariq, Ch. Mohammad Sharif, *Kashmir in Strangulation*, Mirpur, Self Published, 1991.
- Taseer, C. Bilquees, *The Kashmir of Sheikh Muhammad Abdullah*, Lahore, Ferozsons, 1986.
- Teng, Mohan Krishen, Ram Krishen Kaul Bhatt and Santosh Kaul, editors, *Kashmir Constitutional History and Documents*, New Delhi, Light & Life, 1977.
- , *Kashmir Legal Documents*, Second Edition, January 2006, <http://ikashmir.net/historicaldocuments/doc/historicaldocuments.pdf> [accessed 25 March 2013] (first published by Light & Life Publishers, [New Delhi], 1977).
- The Azad Jammu and Kashmir Interim Constitution Act, 1974 (Amended upto [sic] date) May 1997*, Muzaffarabad, Azad Govt. of the State of Jammu & Kashmir (Law, Justice and Parliamentary Affairs Deptt.), 1997.
- The Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi*, New Delhi, Publications Division, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India:
 ———, Volume LXXXIX (August 1, 1947–November 10, 1947), 1983;
 ———, Volume XC (November 11, 1947—January 30, 1948), 1984.
- 'The Indus Waters Treaty', *The Henry L. Stimson Center*, www.stimson.org/southasia/?sn=sa20020116300, [accessed 8 October 2008].
- The Kashmir Dispute and Its Solution. Statement in Parliament by M.A. Gurmani*, [Karachi], Government of Pakistan, [1951].
- The Kashmir Question*, [Lucknow], The Lucknow University, 1950.

- The Testament of Sheikh Abdullah*, New Delhi, Palit and Palit, 1974.
- The Times*, London.
- Thomas, Raju G.C., Editor, *Perspectives on Kashmir. The Roots of Conflict in South Asia*, Boulder, Westview Press, 1992.
- Thomson, George, MP, 'The Two Kashmirs', *Aspect*, London, Volume 8, September 1963.
- Tikku, Somnath, *Kashmir Speaking*, Srinagar, Raina's News Agency, [1946?].
- Tinker, Hugh, *India and Pakistan. A Political Analysis*, New York, Frederick A. Praeger, 1962.
- Topographical Department of India, *[Map of] India 1872*, Calcutta, Surveyor General's Office, [1872].
- , *[Map of] Turkestan and the Countries Between the British and Russians Dominions in Asia*, Calcutta, Surveyor General's Office, [1875].
- 'Treaty of Amritsar', *Kashmir Information Network*, www.kashmir-information.com/LegalDocs/TreatyofAmritsar.html [accessed 15 March 2011].
- Tremblay, Reeta Chowdhari, 'Jammu: Autonomy Within an Autonomous Kashmir?', in Raju G.C. Thomas, Editor, *Perspectives on Kashmir. The Roots of Conflict in South Asia*, Boulder, Westview Press, 1992.
- Tyndale Biscoe, C.E., *Kashmir in Sunlight & Shade*, London, Seeley Service, Second Edition, 1925, [First Published 1921?].
- , *Tyndale-Biscoe of Kashmir. An Autobiography*, London, Seeley Service, [1951?].
- Tyson, Geoffrey, *Nehru: The Years of Power*, London, Pall Mall Press, 1966.
- United Nations maps [all accessed 11 July 2012]:
- Jammu and Kashmir Area: www.un.org/Depts/Cartographic/map/profile/kashmir.pdf;
- , Pakistan: www.un.org/Depts/Cartographic/map/profile/pakistan.pdf;
- , South Asia: www.un.org/Depts/Cartographic/map/profile/Souteast-Asia.pdf.
- United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan [UNCIP], *Report of the Sub-committee on Western Kashmir*, [New York], Unpublished Restricted Document, 31 March 1949.
- 'UN removes Jammu and Kashmir from list of disputes', *The Daily Times*, 16 November 2010.
- 'US government asked to correct its maps on India', *(Indian) Ministry of External Affairs*, 21 November 2011, www.mea.gov.in/media-briefings.htm?dtl/7095/US+government+asked+to+correct+its+maps+on+India [accessed 1 December 2012].
- Varshney, Ashutosh, 'India, Pakistan, and Kashmir. Antinomies of Nationalism', *Asian Survey*, Volume 31, Number 11, November 1991.
- Vigne, G.T., *Travels in Kashmir, Ladak, [sic] Iskardo*, London, Henry Colburn, 1844, Volumes I and II, Second Edition.
- Wani, G.A., *Kashmir History and Politics 1846–1994. A Select Annotated Bibliography*, Srinagar, Tariq Enterprises, Second Edition, 1996.
- Wani, Gul Mohd., *Kashmir Politics and Prospects*, New Delhi, Ashish Publishing, 1993.
- , Compiler, *Kashmir: From Autonomy to Azadi*, Srinagar, Valley Book House, 1996.
- Wani, Gull Mohd., and Naqash, Nasir A., *Reflections on Kashmir Politics*, New Delhi, Ashish Publishing, 1993.
- Weinreich, Matthias, *Pashtun Migrants in the Northern Areas of Pakistan*, Karachi, Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Whitehead, Andrew, *A Mission in Kashmir*, New Delhi, Penguin Viking, 2007.
- Whither Kashmir?*, London, The Diplomatic Press and Publishing Co., 1950.

- White Paper on Jammu & Kashmir*, [Delhi], Government of India, [1948].
- Widmalm, Sten, 'The Rise and Fall of Democracy in Jammu and Kashmir', *Asian Survey*, Volume XXXVII, Number 11, 1997.
- Wirsing, Robert, *India, Pakistan, and the Kashmir Dispute*, Calcutta, Rupa & Co., 1995.
- , 'The Kashmir Territorial Dispute: The Indus Runs Through It', *Brown Journal of World Affairs*, Fall/Winter 2008, Vol. XV, Issue I.
- Wolpert, Stanley, *A New History of India*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, Second Edition, 1982.
- , *India and Pakistan: Continued Conflict or Cooperation?*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 2011.
- Wong, Edward, 'Waiting for Reincarnation at a Spiritual Birthplace', *New York Times*, 26 August 2009, www.nytimes.com/2009/08/26/world/asia/26dalailama.html [accessed 24 January 2012].
- Yasin, Mohammad and Rafiqi, Qaiyum A., Editors, *History of the Freedom Struggle in Jammu & Kashmir*, New Delhi, Light & Life, 1980.
- Yasin, Muhammad and Yasin, Madhavi, *Mysteries and Glimpses of Kashmir*, New Delhi, Raj Publications, 1996.
- Year Book 2006–2007*, Government of Pakistan, Ministry of Kashmir Affairs and Northern Areas, Islamabad, [2007].
- Yusuf, Moeed and Adil Najam, 'Kashmir: ripe for resolution?', *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 30, no. 8, 2009.
- Zaheer, Hasan, *The Times and Trials of the Rawalpindi Conspiracy 1951*, Karachi, Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Zutshi, Chitralkha, *Languages of Belonging: Islam, Regional Identity, and the Making of Kashmir*, London, Hurst and Co., 2004.
- Zutshi, U.K., *Emergence of Political Awakening in Kashmir*, New Delhi, Manohar, 1986.
- '15th round of talks between the Special Representatives of India and China on the Boundary Question', (Indian) Ministry of External Affairs, 17 January 2012, <http://mea.gov.in/press-releases.htm?dtl/17892/15th+round+of+talks+between+the+Special+Representatives+of+India+and+China+on> [accessed 26 January 2012].
- 1947–1997 The Kashmir Dispute at Fifty: Charting Paths to Peace*, [New York], Kashmir Study Group, 1997.
- 1998 Census Report of Azad Kashmir*, Islamabad, Population Census Organization, Statistics Division, Government of Pakistan, July 2001.

INDEX

- Abdullah, Dr Farooq, Kashmiri politician: [200](#), [201](#), [202](#), [205](#)
- Abdullah, Sheikh Muhammad, Kashmiri leader: desire for independence for J&K, [152](#), [156](#), [182](#), [193](#), [210](#); detentions, [197–9](#); India and Pakistan, [291](#); ‘Lion of Kashmir’, [131](#); Hari Singh, [157](#), [170](#); post-accession role, [191–3](#), [274](#); Pukhtoons’ invasion, [172](#); return to office 1975–1982, [200–2](#), [228](#); role in princely state, [131–4](#), [155](#); sacking of 1953, [171](#), [196](#), [198](#), [226](#), [249](#), [262](#); visit to Pakistan, Azad Kashmir, [183](#)
- Afghanistan: [13](#), [74](#), [77](#), [115](#), [125](#), [142–3](#), [161](#), [180](#), [229](#), [244](#), [267](#), [274](#), [280–1](#), [286](#), [289](#), [290](#), [311](#) FN69, [312](#) FN76, [322](#) FN65; foreign and/ or British involvement, [37–40](#), [41–54](#), [57](#), [58](#), [59](#), [66](#), [67](#), [68](#), [83](#), [84](#), [92–3](#), [98](#), [99](#), [102](#), [103](#), [104](#), [105](#), [109](#); irredentism, [158](#); second British-Afghan war, [96](#), [100–1](#); third British-Afghan war, [116](#)
- Akbar, third Mughal Emperor: [29](#), [32–3](#), [291](#)
- Aksai Chin: meaning, [10](#); description, [65](#); Dogra possession, [73](#), [121–2](#); China-India rivalry/ fighting over, [232–3](#), [235](#), [237](#), [277](#), [303](#); Frontier Districts Province, [139](#); map, [93](#); strategic importance re Siachen Glacier, [248](#); 1842 treaty, [65](#)
- Alexander, Tsar of Russia: [39](#), [84](#)
- Alexander the Great, of Macedon/ Greece: [38](#), [39](#), [106](#)
- Ali, Sher, Afghan ruler: [100–1](#)
- All Parties Hurriyat (Freedom) Conference: [204](#), [271](#)
- Amritsar, Treaty of: [72–3](#), [75](#), [77](#), [79](#), [89–91](#), [126](#), [128](#), [313](#) FN4
- Anglo-Russia Boundary Commission: [103](#), [104](#), [105](#)
- Anglo-Russia Convention 1907, [113](#)
- Anglo-Sikh war: first, [57–8](#), [68](#), [69](#), [71](#), [72](#), [73](#), [76](#), [87](#); second, [58](#), [77](#), [78](#), [88](#)
- Ashoka, Mauryan Emperor: [13](#); founder of Srinagar, [31](#)
- Aurangzeb, sixth Mughal Emperor: [13](#), [33](#), [36](#)
- Azad, Ghulam Nabi, Kashmiri politician: [192](#), [205](#)
- Azad Army/forces/militia: [156](#), [176](#), [181](#), [187](#), [191](#), [209](#)
- Azad Jammu and Kashmir: see [Azad Kashmir](#)
- Azad Kashmir: [xi](#), [8–12](#), [150](#), [165–8](#), [186](#), [190](#), [191](#), [207–216](#), [246–7](#), [320](#) FN49; Azad Army, [176](#), [181](#), [187](#); compared with Gilgit-Baltistan, [221–2](#); cross-LOC activities, [259](#), [271](#); earthquake, [260](#); Heads of Agreement with Pakistan, [207](#), [208](#), [217](#); hydel in, [231](#); increased area, [287](#); Kashmiris’ anti-India uprising, [252](#), [258](#); Mangla Dam, [215](#), [219](#); maps, [120–1](#); Poonch Jagir/Poonchis [21](#), [123](#); lack of recognition/ local authority, [195](#), [210–1](#), [228](#); provincial status, [289](#); Pukhtoon invasion, [171–2](#)
- Azad Kashmiris: [10](#), [179](#), [192](#), [204](#), [217](#), [219](#), [225](#), [246](#); knew of Pukhtoon invasion, [172](#); India more attractive, [290](#); in Azad Kashmir, [209–16](#); Pakistan-Administered J&K [207–9](#); opinion poll in, [278](#); stateless, [282](#)
- Azad Kashmir Regiment of Pakistan Army: [215](#)

azadi: 155, 253, 280, 288; ‘Azadi-ites’, 10

Babur, first Mughal Emperor: 30, 38

Bakshi, Ghulam Muhammad, Kashmiri politician: 198, 199, 226, 240

Balawaristan, independent ‘land of the highlanders’: 219, 279

Baltistan: 20, 32, 65, 216, 255, 259, 269, 306; Balawaristan, 219; Baltistan Agency, 218; captured by Gulab Singh, 75; in Gilgit-Baltistan, 12; in Northern Areas, 180; maps, 92–3, 120–1; Northern Areas/Gilgit-Baltistan region, 216–23; princely state, 93, 305; Scouts, 185; Skardu, 121, 180, 182, 185, 216, 218, 259

Bangladesh: 16, 287, 303–4, 325 FN51; Chittagong Hill Tracts, 160; Indian enclaves, 150

Bazaz, Prem Nath, Kashmiri politician: 155, 191–2

Beg, Yaqub, ruler of Kashgaria: 94–5

begaar: 26, 179

Bengal/Bengalis: 16, 24, 36, 50, 144–5, 158, 245, 265, 273, 274, 303–4; Bengal Army, 76; Bengali leaders of Pakistan, 162

Berlin, Congress of: 96, 100, 101

Bharat: 14; Akhand Bharat, 148

Bhutto, Zulfikar Ali, Pakistan leader: 162, 183, 212, 218, 220, 245, 247; negotiations with Swaran Singh, 262–3; Simla Agreement, 246

Bolsheviks: 114–6; ‘bacillus of Bolshevism’, 116; British clash with, 61 FN316

Bozai Gumbaz incident: 104–5

British/ Britishers/British Indian Empire: 13–4; 285, 299, 311 FN69, 313–3 FN13; after 1846–1880s: 78–86; Afghanistan, 46–54; Afghanistan campaign 1839–41, 50–4; Britishers, 14; Central Asia, 49, 52–3; China-Tibet, 121–3; consolidating J&K, 86–111; ‘Doctrine of Lapse’, 79, 80; forward/backward/masterly inactivity policy, 37–8, 47–8, 86, 101, 111; French/Persians, 39–41; geo-strategic situation after 1846, 78–80; Gilgit uprising, 179; Hari Singh, 131–2; historical/strategic context of India, 36–54; Indian Empire established, 37–46; Indian Empire in 1947, 135–7, 140–2, 145; India/ Pakistan dominions, 147–8, 158–163, 318 FN11, 318 FN13; interest in Ladakh, 90; Johnson Line, 121–2, 238; officials in J&K, 88; political situation after 1846, 81–3; Poonch, 123, 127–8; Pratap Singh/Council of State, 124–9; Russians, 36–42, 45–6, 96–8; sale of Kashmir, 71–78; ‘second XI’, 78; Sikh Empire, 54–8; strategic concerns after 1895, 111–9; strategic situation post-Mutiny, 83–6; tourists in Kashmir, 34; why British relinquished Kashmir, 73–8

Buddhism/Buddhists: 9, 138; Ashoka, 13; Chittagong Hill Tracts, 160; Jesus’ involvement, 26, 309 FN29; Ladakh, 15, 20, 140, 168, 182, 190; Ladakh Buddhist Association, 196–7; Mahayana, 27–8; Tibetan, 233

Bukhara, Emir of: 42, 49; 85, 86

Burnes, Captain Alexander ‘Bukhara’, British Envoy in Kabul: 49, 50, 52

Ceasefire 1949/ceasefire line: 120, 185, 235, 303; divides J&K, 218; Karachi Agreement demarcates, 185–6, 247; renamed LOC, 186; UNMOGIP, 264

Central Asia khanates (see also Bukhara, Khiva, Kokand): 42, 93; demise of, 85–86

Chamber of Princes: 136, 148

China: 314 FN22, 325 FN51; attractiveness to J&K-ites, 291; Afghanistan border, 105, 289; border agreement with Pakistan, 238–9; border with India, 120, 121, 122, 191, 248, 277, 286, 329 FN24; British relations, 65, 77, 112, 114; British trade, 20; J&K, 118, 136, 139; Hunza, 108–9, 119; India (post-British), 123; Mahayana Buddhism, 27; Manchuria, 117; relations with Pakistan, 180, 240, 243–5, 288; Sinkiang/Turkestan, 94–9, 111, 115; Tibet, 113, 315–6 FN58; tribute paid, 23, 109, 119; 1962 war with India, 232–8, 303

Chitral: 20; *Mehtar* (ruler)/ relationship with J&K: 109–11; Yaghistan, 219

Cis-Sutlej: 44, 54, 56, explanation of term, 64 FN311

Congress, Indian National: 132, 141, 145–6, 149, 159, 161, 163, 320 FN38; Abdullah, 155; J&K on its agenda, 133–4, 177; post-1947: 183, 192, 200, 202, 204, 205, 242, 299; United Progressive Alliance, 269, 270

Crimean War: 83, 84

Dalai Lama: 113, 233; reincarnation at Tawang, 233

Dixon, Sir Owen, UN Representative: 224–226; 263

Dogras: 21, 61, 63, 81, 164; challenges to Dogra rule, 124–134, 180, 217; Dogra forces, 62–3, 65, 107–8; Dogra rule of J&K, 21, 34, 58, 75, 80, 86–97, 107–110, 118, 196; ‘Dograistan’, 152; *darbar* move, 205–6; end of Dogra rule, 170–1, 179–180, 217; in Sikh Empire/Punjab, 63–5, 81; maharajas, 299; refugees, 166; treaty with Tibet-China, 65, 233; what Dogras did not control in J&K, 119–124

Durand, Algernon, Political Agent, Gilgit Agency: 96–7, 107; Hunza-Nagar Field Force, 108

Durand, Mortimer, Foreign Secretary of India/ Durand Line: 105–6, 109, 122; Afghanistan’s non-recognition of Durand Line, 158

Durrani, Afghan rulers: 43–4, 56; re Kashmir, 55, 173, 281

East India Company: 14, 36–7, 41, 68, 313 FN1, 314 FN13; Afghanistan, 45, 48, 53; Kashmir, 74; Mutiny, 79–81; Punjab, 44, 54, 57, 58, 76; ‘second XI’, 78

East Pakistan: 141, 144, 147, 158, 212, 214; Bengalis’ disenchantment, 162; Chittagong Hill Tracts: 160; Indian enclaves, 150; India-Pakistan war, 245–6, 264, 274, 303–4

Expeditionary forces, bad years for: 67–8

Federally Administered Tribal Areas (of Pakistan): 267, 276

Frontier Districts Province of J&K: 12, 16, 21, 23, 35, 119, 168; description, 138–140; *illaqas* (areas), 23; northern frontier of J&K, 87, 91–6, 105, 109–111, 117; rulers’ accessions to Pakistan, 180

Frontier Districts in Punjab/ North-Western Frontier Region (later NWFP): 12, 25, 58–9, 93, 110

Gandamak Treaty: 100, 101

Gandhi, Indira, Prime Minister of India: 30, 200, 201, 228; prime minister, 183, 242; Simla Agreement, 246, 263

Gandhi, Mahatma, Indian leader: 118, 161; fast for Pakistan, 158; Hari Singh, 177

Gandhi, Rajiv, Prime Minister of India: 30, 202

GBians (Gilgit-Baltistanis): 221, 223, 289, 290; stateless, 282

Germany, rise of: [113](#), [114](#), [115](#)

Gilgit: [12](#), [20](#), [22](#), [26](#), [94](#), [95](#), [98](#), [191](#); anti-maharaja uprising, [170](#), [179–180](#), [181](#), [217](#), [281](#); capital of Gilgit-Baltistan, [216](#); Dogra involvement, [107](#); Gilgit town, [106–7](#), [118](#), [165](#), [179](#); Karakorum Highway, [218](#); Kashgar, [112](#), [117](#), [243](#), [244](#); maps, [92–3](#); NWFP, Punjab, [153](#), [218](#); no wheeled transport, [26](#); provisional government, 1947, [217](#); Raja, [90](#); Ranbir Singh's possession, [90–2](#); terrain around, [93–4](#)

Gilgit Agency: [22](#), [96](#), [118–9](#), [218](#), [305](#); created 1877, [93](#); Dogra involvement in, [107](#), [120](#), [129](#); maps, [120–1](#), [247](#); re-established 1889, [97](#), [106](#), [108–9](#), [117–8](#), [119](#); [124](#); retrocession to Hari Singh, [120](#), [179](#), [217](#)

Gilgit Leased Area: [109](#), [118](#), [119](#); loss to Hari Singh, [123](#), [124](#); retrocession to Hari Singh, [120](#), [179](#), [217](#)

Gilgit Scouts/forces: [109](#), [114](#), [191](#), [255](#); against India, [185](#); Northern Scouts, [185](#); relief of Chitral, [110](#); support anti-maharaja uprising, [179](#), [217](#)

Gilgit-Baltistan (formerly Northern Areas): [244](#), [260](#), [289](#); Balawaristan, [279](#); Bunji Dam, [220](#); Kashmir dispute, [120–1](#), [260](#); maps, [120–1](#); Pakistan-Administered J&K, [207–9](#); region itself, [216–223](#), [306](#); use of term, [11–12](#)

Government of India Act: 1858, [79](#), [81](#); 1935, [147](#)

'Great Game'/'Tournament of Shadows': [4](#), [45–8](#), [98](#), [100](#), [111](#), [242](#); end, [113](#), [285](#)

Gurdaspur, awarded to India: [160](#), [162–3](#), [177](#), [273](#)

Hazara/Hazaras: [56](#), [312](#) FN76, [341](#) FN27; Gilgit-Baltistan, [217–8](#), [219](#); Gulab Singh, [67](#); territorial adjustment with J&K, [89](#)

Hazratbal, sacred relic: [30](#), [240](#)

Herat: [83](#), [102](#), [103](#); strategic location, [41–42](#)

Hindustan: [13](#), [15](#), [308](#) FN7

Hindustani language: [319](#) FN18

Hindustani Fanatics: [15](#), [267](#)

Humayan, Mughal Emperor: [42](#), [145](#)

Hunza: [93](#), [124](#); Attabad landslide, [243](#); gateway to, [124](#); incorporation into J&K: [106–10](#), [119–120](#); irregulars, [110](#); jagir in Yarkand, [108](#), [119](#); Pakistan, [218](#); polo, [20](#); relations with China/Raskam, [112](#), [114](#), [119](#), [238](#); ruler's accession to Pakistan, [180](#); Russia, [105](#), [106](#)

Hunza-Nagar: disenchantment, [107–8](#); Field Force, [108](#)

Hyderabad: [135–6](#), [145](#); independent Usmanistan, [144](#); joins India, [149](#), [151–2](#); re Hyderabad, Pakistan, [317–8](#) FN5; use of Urdu, [319](#) FN18

Imam-ud-Din, Sheikh, Governor of Kashmir: [88–9](#)

Imperial Service Corps: [108](#), [109](#)

India: the term, [13–14](#); invasion routes, [91–2](#)

India, Union of (post-British): borders and bloodshed 1947, [159–163](#), [166–7](#); British departure/creation of, [144–8](#); China-India war, [232–8](#); China-Pakistan border agreement, [238–9](#); Composite Dialogue, [267–8](#), [270–2](#); controversial accessions (non-J&K), [148–152](#); expansion/losses of territory, [286–7](#), [289](#); Gilgit-Baltistan, [219–220](#); Hari Singh's accession, [169–171](#),

177–81; Indian J&K, 191–207; India-Pakistan ‘trust deficit’, 272–7; Indus Waters Treaty, 228–231; J&K becomes international issue, 171–6; J&K’s accession, 153–9; Kargil ‘war’, 255–7; Kashmiris’ uprising, 249–53; Kashmir dispute, 223–6, 261–6, 282–3, 290–1; LOC, 259–260; Musharraf-Singh talks, 268–70; nuclear capability, 253–5; plebiscite, 182–8, 226–8; Siachen Glacier, 247–9; terrorism, 257–9; wars with Pakistan, 303–4; 1965 war, 239–245; 1971 war, 245–7

India-Pakistan Question (the Kashmir dispute) at UNSC: 9, 183, 242, 263, 264

Indian Army (British): 14, 33, 37, 48, 101, 103, 104, 177; Army of Retribution: 53, 66; Army of the Indus: 48, 50, 51, 65, 67; Bengal Army, 50, 76; Commander-in-Chief, 83; fight Sikhs, 37, 57–8, 71; Gulab Singh in Army of Retribution, 66–7; J&K, 108, 110; Poonchis, 89, 165; Punjabis, 78, 88–9; Queen’s Army, 76

Indian Air Force: 194, 256, 270, 304; Royal, 172, 175–6

Indian Army (post-1947): 258, 272–5; against China, 232–8; Hyderabad, 152; India-Pakistan ceasefire 2003, 259; Junagadh, 149; J&K, 174–7, 180–2, 185–7, 191, 194, 209, 249–51; 281, 282; Kargil ‘war’, 255–7; minimal forces and plebiscite, 187, 264, 266, 272; Siachen Glacier, 247–9; wars in/over, J&K, 303–4; 1965 war, 236–7, 239–242; 1971 war, 245–7

Indian Independence Act, 1947: 141, 147–8

Indian J&K: 167, 186, 189, 189–207, 210, 224, 240–1, 249–252, 260, 268–9, 273, 278, 290, 310 FN41, 319 FN18, 323 FN12; Aksai Chin, 233; international focus/ legitimate government for J&K, 208, 210, 226–8; land reform, 155; prime/ chief ministers, 199, 205, 308 FN9; repressive powers, 251; tourism, 34–35; use of term, 12, 170–1

Indian Ocean: Indian Sea, Al Bahr al Hindi, 13; British ‘lake’, 84

Indian security/ paramilitary forces in J&K: 194, 203, 204, 249–53, 271, 273

Indus River: 13–14, 40, 43–4, 48, 50, 56, 59, 65; acrostic ‘Pakistan’, 142; description, 55, 308 FN5; importance to Pakistan, 153; Punjab’s ‘five rivers’, 55; Sind River, Kashmir, 308 FN5; ‘Sindhu’, 13; Treaty of Amritsar, 72, 90; upper riparian, 325 FN51; water storages, 219–20

Indus Waters Treaty: 228–231

Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI), Directorate of: 249, 252, 258, 273, 290

Iran/ Persia: 115, 145; acrostic ‘Pakistan’, 143; East Persian Cordon: 115–6; Herat, 53, 83; Iranian plateau, 38; Kashmir, 28, 30, 130, 286; Persian threat/ demise, 39–43, 45, 46, 47, 53, 79, 115–6; spiritual leadership for Kargilis, 256; terms, 308 FN14

Islam: 2, 9, 15–16, 44; apostates, 15–16; Islamic extremists, 16, 267, 203, 231; Ismaili, 140; Kashmir, 28–30, 139, 155–6, 178, 203; militant groups, 252; not a monolith, 15–16, 144, 287; Pakistan, 16–17, 144; 247, 290; Pakistan’s irredentism, 178; sectarianism, 16, 32, 219, 256; Shia, 137, 140, 190, 197, 217, 219, 256, 289, 312 FN76; Sufi, 33; Sunni, 7, 16, 28–9, 32, 139, 164, 178, 190, 217, 219, 312 FN76

Jahangir, fourth Mughal Emperor: 33, 36, 292

Jammu/Jammu Province: 80, 87, 92, 125, 131, 185, 189–91, 242, 288, 289, 303, 305–6, 317 FN78; connections with Sikhs/ British, 54–6, 58, 60–9; *darbar*, 205; Gulab Singh in 1846, 75–6; inter-religious violence, 165–8, 173, 174, 281; Jammu town/City, 34, 60, 125, 137, 139, 153, 162, 166, 175, 185, 197, 205, 241, 253, 317 FN78; in 1947, 137–9, 146; Kashmir sold to Raja of Jammu, 71–3, 75, 76; Kashmiris’ anti-India uprising, 202, 203, 250, 251; ‘lesser’ region than Kashmir,

18–21, 194–6; Muslim Conference, 132–4, 155; pilgrimages, 35; representatives, 201, 206; violence/ situation in 1947, 153, 156, 162–70, 173, 174, 175, 177, 181, 182

Jammuites: 10, 21, 60–69, 71, 87, 129–130, 134, 137, 140, 182, 281; Indian J&K, 195–6, 206; Jammu Province: 8, 16, 21, 35, 56, 62, 92–3, 119, 123, 131, 133, 262, 281, 288, 303, 305; Kashmiris' anti-India uprising, 204; in 1947, 137–138, 146, 153, 155, 156, 162, 177, 181, 191, 195; inter-religious violence, 165–70, 174; loses pre-eminence, 194–5; resolving Kashmir dispute, 268–9, 279

Jammu Kashmir Liberation Front (JKLF): 214, 252, 279

Jammu and Kashmir (J&K): 2, 7–9, 35; consolidating princely state, 86–97; Dogra-British ignorance, 92; five regions of post-1947, 8, 12, 189–223, 305–6; four political entities in 1949, 191; in 1947, 135–140; maps, 92–3; other regions, 19–21; terminology, 7–8, 10–12; territorial adjustments, 89

Japan: rise, 104, 117, 119, 123, 127; Army's surrender, 148; Russia, 112, 114

Jamwal Rajput, Jammu: 61, 164, 182

Jesus/Issa/Hazrat Yousaf Asif: 26–7, 309 FN28; similarity with Samdhimati, 27

Jhelum River/Valley/Road: 21, 25, 26, 31, 34, 153, 172–3; Kishenganga/Neelum, 231; road re-opened, 259; Tulbul Navigation project, 230; 'windpipe' 138

Jinnah, Muhammad Ali, founder of Pakistan: J&K accession, 177; J&K as 'ripe fruit', 156, 157; Kashmir, 133–4, 155–7; 'moth eaten' Pakistan, 144, 273; Pakistan/'Jinnahstan', 144–6, 148, 320 FN38; popularity, 137; post-Jinnah, 182; Pukhtoon invasion, 172

Junagadh: controversial accession, 149–51, 154; plebiscite, 149, 161; provisional council, 150

J&K-ites: 10, 178, 226; attractiveness of China, 292; desires for independence, 277–281; entitlement to vote, 140; indirectly connected, 207; lack of external support, 276; lack of involvement in Kashmir dispute, 291; 'Let the People Decide', 281–3; opening of LOC, 259–260; plebiscite, 262, 265, 266; role/desires in 1947, 181–2, 194, 288; state subject status, 129–130

Kak, Ramchandra, Prime Minister of J&K: 155, 177

Kalhana, author of *Rajatarangini*: 23, 27

Kamran Shah, ruler of Herat: 41–2, 49

Karakoram Highway (KKH): 218, 219–220, 243–4, 248; Kunjerab Pass, 248; potential Indian control of, 289

Kargil: 182, 185, 197, 278, 305, 306; links with Skardu, 218, 259; strategic importance, 232; 'war', 255–7, 273, 304

Kashgaria: 94, 95, 98, 99, 117, 119

Kashmir Affairs, Ministry of (Pakistan): 208, 211, 212, 214

Kashmir Affairs and Northern Affairs/Gilgit-Baltistan, Ministry of (Pakistan): 120, 213, 216, 217, 221, 222, 271

Kashmir dispute, the: 2–3, 18–19; attempts to resolve, 261–4; Composite Dialogue, 266–71; contentious accession, 177–182; euphemism for India-Pakistan question, 9; forty-eight 'road-maps', 261; future possibilities, 288–91; independence, 277–81; India-Pakistan 'trust deficit', 272–6; instigation of contest over J&K, 171–6; J&K-ites sidelined, 176, 181; official positions of India and Pakistan, 264–6; one way to resolve, 281–3; People's Plebiscite, 182–8, 226–8; 'rabbit pulled out of a hat', 3; Sir Owen Dixon, 224–6; two matters unchanged since 1949, 223; why

unresolved, 276–7

Kashmir/ Kashmir Valley/Vale of Kashmir: 2–3, 7–17, 291–2; Afghan involvement, 24, 28, 31; anti-India uprising, 202–205, 206, 249–253, 304; desire for independence, 277–81; desired by/ links with Pakistan, 142–3, 146, 153, 155–6, 169, 172–6, 178; etymology, 22–3; European visitors, 74–5, 130; Indian J&K, 189–90, 191–5; 1947–49, 169–70, 171–6, 181–2, 185, 187–8, 240, 241; links with other areas, 21–2, 25–6, 34; LOC, 259-major routes into, 21–2; Mughals, 32–3; natural calamities, 91; Nehru, 156, 197–8, 199, 201–2; princely state, 80, 87–9, 130–3, 138–9; 125; prestige, 17–35; religions/ religious figures, 27–31; Rules for Visitors, 301–2; sale of, 71–8; strategic link with Ladakh, 232; terrorism, 257; three speculations, 291–2; tourism, 34–5; United Nations, 225; Vale, 8, 18; weather, 24–5

Kashmir Province: 8, 18, 21, 31, 32, 47, 56, 74, 92–3, 131, 133, 156–7, 281, 305; in 1947, 137–9; Pukhtoon invasion, 168–75, 181, 272

Kashmir and Jammu: 35

Kashmiriness/Kashmiriyat: 29, 30, 203

Kashmiris: 1–35, 43, 55–6, 72, 74, 75, 91, 112, 125, 138, 140, 187, 206, 262, 269, 271, 276, 289, 290–2; accession desires, 155–6; ancestors, 23; anti-India uprising, 202–205, 249–253, 260, 304; desires for independence, 277–280, 286, 288; Indian mistrust of, 17, 322 FN2; inspired by East Timor, 286; Indian J&K, 134, 192–202; in Pakistan, 214–5; not pro-Pakistan, 155; nuclear war, 254–5; ‘old’ Kashmiris, 29–30, 327 FN 72; oppose Gulab Singh, 87–8; oppose Hari Singh, 118, 130–1; Pukhtoon invasion, 173–81, 281; sacred relic, 240; terminology, 9–10, 18; ‘wildcard’ re accession, 155–6; 1965 war, 241

Kashyapa Mir/Kashyapa Meru, mountain: 22

Kautilya, Indian philosopher: 178, 321 FN61

Khalsa Dal/Sikh Army: 57, 61, 62, 66, 72, 76; senior foreigners in, 57

Khan, Abdul Qayyum Khan, Chief Minister, NWFP: 171–2

Khan, Sardar Muhammad Alam, first Political Agent in Northern Areas: 179–180

Khan, Amanullah, Afghan ruler: 116

Khan, General Mohammad Ayub, Pakistan dictator: 120, 162, 239–42; makes Rawalpindi, then Islamabad, capital, 161–2

Khan, Dost Mohammad, Afghan ruler: 42, 44, 69; grandson, 101; opposing British, 47–54; returns to Afghanistan, 53–54; takes Herat, and dies, 83–4; tries to regain Peshawar, 58

Khan, Sardar Ibrahim, first President of Azad Kashmir: 168, 172, 210

Khan, Liaquat Ali, Prime Minister of Pakistan: 172, 182, 261

Khiva, Khan of: 39, 42, 85–6

Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Province (formerly North-West Frontier Province): 219, terrorism, 252, 258; use of term, 10–12

Kokand: 85; Khan of, 42, 86; Russia’s acquisition, 93, 97–9, 102

Ladakh: 19, 20, 32, 296–7, 305; Aksai Chin, 65, 121–2, 139, 232–3, 235, 237; British interest/ agents/trade, 85, 88, 90, 113; Buddhists, 15, 20, 140, 168, 182, 309 FN29; Buddhist Association, 196–7; disenchantment with Kashmiris, 269–270; fighting over 1947–9, 185; Gulab Singh’s control, 62–68, 73, 75, 121; *gyalpo* rule, 20; Indian J&K, 189–91, 195–7, 201, 204, 206, 225, 289;

Kargil 'war', 255–7; lack of map, 92–3; LOC, 259; tourists, 35; trade with China/ Tibet, 90, 113
 Ladakhis: 20, 140, 168, 182, 195, 196, 197, 204, 206, 268, 281
 Lahore Resolution, 1940: 15
 Lahore, Treaty of: 72–3
 Lawrence, Henry, British Resident in Punjab: 74, 76; Gulab Singh, 67, 69, 71, 72, 75, 89
 Line of Actual Control (between China and India): 235
 Line of Control (LOC) in J&K: 189, 244, 246, 273, 274, 282, 275, 304; as international border, 246, 265, 269, 279, 289; ceasefire line renamed, 186; crossing points, 259–60, 291; end point (NJ 980 420) 120, 247; fencing, 252; Kargil 'war', 255–7, 273; make irrelevant, 269, 291; makes J&K 'imagined' entity, 186; Line of Commerce, 250, 259; opening of, 259–260, 271; UNMOGIP, 264
 Macartney, George, British representative/consul, Kashgar: 111–12
 MacGregor, Sir Charles, Head of Indian Intelligence Department: 101–2
 Manavadar, princely state: 149, 150
 Mangrol, princely state: 149, 150
 Maps: 60, 92; Aksai Chin, 232–3; cartographic aggression, 120–2, 233; 'correct' Indian maps, 11, 121; J&K, 92–3, 308 FN4, 308 FN6; LOC, 120, 186; Junagadh, Manavadar as Pakistan, 150; 'map claim', 233, 238; Northern Areas/ Gilgit-Baltistan not part of J&K, 119–120, 209; Turkestan, 93; Wavell's envisaged India-Pakistan border, 320 FN38
 Mauryan Empire/Mauryans: 13, 38
 McMahon Line: 122, 235; 'McMohan' Line, 122
 Merv: 102–3; 'Mervousness', 102
 Mountbatten, Lord Louis, last Viceroy of India: 147–8, 159–160, 273, 318 FN13; Hari Singh, 160; Jodhpur, 146; J&K's accession, 175; Nehru, 163; plebiscite, 182
 'Muscovite Menace'/ British fear of Russians: 40, 53, 111
 Musharraf, General Pervez, Pakistan dictator: 254; almost resolves Kashmir dispute, 289; Kargil 'war'/nuclear war, 254–5; seeks better relations with India, 264, 266–70, 289, 291; support for terrorism, 252
 Muslim Conference: 133–4, 155–7, 164, 191–2; Azad Kashmir, 211, 214; renamed, 133
 Muslim League: 133–4, 141; J&K, 155–9, 273; Lahore Resolution, 15
 Mutiny of 1857–58: 79–81; post-Mutiny, 81–3, 124
 Nagar: 93, incorporation into J&K: 106–10, 119–120; irregulars, 110; ruler's accession to Pakistan, 180; under Pakistan, 218
 National Conference: 132–4, 155–6, 164, 170, 191, 224; elections, 200, 202, 204, 205; Indian J&K, 191–2; 194, 196–8, 202
 'Naya Kashmir' ('New Kashmir'): 132, 133
 Nehru, Jawaharlal, Prime Minister of India: Aksai Chin, 233; *Arthashastra*, 178; attachment to Kashmir, 19, 30, 155–6, 198; China, 235, 236; Chitral, 110–11; Delhi Agreement with Abdullah, 226; Hari Singh, 133–4, 153, 157, 170; J&K/ Kashmir dispute, 172, 176, 261–2; Indian J&K, 193–8; 'Let the People Decide', 283; plebiscite, 182–3, 226; Mountbatten, 163, 273

Northern Areas (now Gilgit-Baltistan): 11, 180, 186, 190, 199, 228, 248, 255, 265; China-Pakistan border 238; Musharraf, 269; Pakistan-Administered J&K 207–9; region itself, 216–222; use of term, 12; Zia-ul-Haq, 246–7

Northern Light Infantry: 255, 273, 304

North-East Frontier Agency: 235, 237

North-West Frontier Province (NWFP; now Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Province): 10, 12–3 142, 161, 314 FN 27; creation, 58; plebiscite 1947, 161; Frontier Crimes Regulations, 217–8; Northern Areas/Gilgit-Baltistan, 217–8; Pukhtoon invasion, 171–3; terrorism, 252; use of term, 10–12

Nur-ud-Din Wali, Sheikh/Nund Rishi, Kashmiri mystic: 29, 31

‘Occupied’: China-occupied, 10, 238; Indian maps of POK, 121; POK, 121, 189, 210, 220; use of term by India/ Pakistan, 10–12

Oudh (Awadh): 79, 145

Ottoman Empire: 41, 44–6, 83, 99, 100, 114; ‘Eastern Question’, 84; ‘Sick Man of Europe’, 45

Pakistan—the acrostic: 7, 19, 142–4, 146–7; issue of purity, 143–5; ‘k’, 146–7

Pakistan Army: 244; involvement in politics, 183; J&K, 176–7, 185–7, 194, 209, 215, 259, 262, 272–3, 290; High Command, 11; Kargil ‘war’, 255–7; Kashmiris’ anti-Indian uprising, 249, 252; minimal forces and plebiscite, 187, 264, 266, 272; Siachen Glacier, 247–9; terrorism, 257–8, 266, 289–90; uprisings in Poonch, 213; wars in/ over, J&K, 303–4; 1965 war, 236–7, 239–242; 1971 war, 245–7

Pakistan, Islamic Republic of: Azad Kashmir, 209–16; borders and bloodshed 1947, 159–163, 166–7; British departure and creation of, 144–8; China-India war, 236; China-Pakistan allied, 243–5; China-Pakistan border agreement, 238–9; Composite Dialogue, 267–8, 270–2; controversial (non-J&K) accessions, 148–152; expansion/losses of territory, 286–90; Hari Singh’s accession, 169–171, 177–81; India-Pakistan ‘trust deficit’, 272–7; Indus Waters Treaty, 228–231; J&K becomes international issue, 171–6; J&K’s accession, 153–9; ‘logic’ of partition, 141–3; Kargil ‘war’, 255–7; Kashmiris’ anti-India uprising, 250–1, 252; Kashmir dispute, 223–6, 261–6, 282–3, 290–1; LOC, 259–260; Musharraf-Singh talks, 268–70; Northern Areas/Gilgit-Baltistan, 216–223; nuclear capability, 253–5; Pakistan-Administered J&K, 189–91, 207–9; plebiscite, 182–8, 226–8; Siachen Glacier, 247–9; terrorism, 257–9; wars with India, 303–4; 1965 war, 239–245; 1971 war, 245–7

Pakistan-Administered J&K: 11–12, 186, 189–191, 207–23; administrative divisions, 306; opinion poll in, 279; stateless, 282; reserved Indian J&K seats, 227

Pakistan Muslim League: 214, 222

Pamirs: 97–8, 101–6, 111, 295–6; Pamir Gap, 105; Taghdumbash Pamir, 114, 119

Panjdeh Incident: 96, 103–4, 125

Partition: 142–5, 147, 157, 159, 184, 273; ‘logic’/‘rule’: 17, 141, 143, 318 FN11; of J&K, 225, 262–3; polls in NWFP, Sylhet, 161; ‘unfinished business of’, 265

Patel, Sardar, Deputy Prime Minister of India: 142, 172, 187; J&K’s accession to Pakistan, 154

People’s Militia, Kashmir: 169, 181, 191, 281

People’s Plebiscite: 182–8, 196, 209, 210, 262–6; India’s disinterest, 226–8, 246, 274; no longer valid, 277–8, 279; Pakistan calls for, 247; should India call Pakistan’s bluff, 290; withdrawal of

Pakistani forces, 266, 272

People's three actions in J&K in 1947: 165–9, 281; other actions by J&K-ites in 1947–48, 281–2

Persia: see [Iran](#)

Peter the Great, Tsar of Russia: 39, 40

Political Department: 82, 118

Political Agent/ British Agent/ Resident (British official): 82, 83; J&K, 85, 87–8, 90, 93, 96, 107, 110, 118, 301; Hari Singh, 131; Kabul, 101; Kashgar, 112; Punjab, 57, 72, 76; Pratap Singh, 124, 126–7, 299

Poonch/Poonchis: desire for independence, 278; in Indian Army, 89, 165; 1947 uprising, 165–6, 168, 173; 1950s uprisings, 213, 278

Poonch Jagir/Raja of Poonch: 21, 63, 305; Azad Kashmir, 186; Gulab Singh, 129, 312 FN91; Hari Singh's subjugation, 123–4, 129; Jammu Province, 137, 138; Muslims, 165–6, 167, 177; non-Muslims, 320 FN 49; Pratap Singh seeks to adopt Raja, 128–9; size/prestige, 123

Poonch/Poonch City, Indian J&K: 185, 242

Praja Sabha: 131–3, 140, 194

Princely India: 14, 82–3, 145–6; 'Princestan': 145; 1947, 135–7

Pukhtoons/Pushtoons: 54, 56, 142, 280, 311 FN69; Afghanistan, 52, 158; Gulab Singh, 67; independent Pukhtunistan, 161, 173; India, 56, 58, 59–60, 111; invasion of Kashmir Province and ramifications, 168, 169, 171–176, 177, 178, 187, 281, 307 FN1; J&K, 179, 217–8, 219; Pakistan acrostic, 142; *Pukhtoonwali*: 59; 'raiders' and Pakistani support for, 180–1, 185, 272

Punjab: 21; British India province, 58, 76–7, 78, 81; East (Indian) Punjab, 196, 273; Jammu, 61–2; J&K's links with/ dependence on, 153, 156–8, 163, 289; J&K-ites working in, 139, 140; north-western Frontier Districts, 12, 93, 110; partition of, 145, 158, 160; rivers, 55, 229; Sikh Empire, 54–8; term explained, 55; 1965 war

Punjabis: commonality with Jammuites, 130; Indian Army, 88–9; partition, 184

Qing/Manchu dynasty: 97, 114; Hunza paid tribute to, 119

'Quit Kashmir' campaign: 132–3

Radcliffe, Sir Cyril, Chairman of Boundary Commission: 158–160, 177, 273; Boundary Awards, 162–3

Rahman, Abdur, Afghan ruler: 101, 104, 106

Religion, role of, 14–17

Rishis: 22–3; 28–9

Royal Navy: 40, 42, 84, 86, 99, 103; marines in Persia, 42

Russia/Russians: 180; 241–2, 244, 285, 288, 309 FN29, 320 FN38; after 1895, 111–9; Alaska, 313–4 FN13; early rivalry with British, 37–54; expansion of empire, 39–42, 45, 84–86; influence/role in Sinkiang, 97–100; links with J&K rulers, 124–7; northern frontier of J&K, 100–10

Sadiq, G.M., Kashmiri politician: 200–1, 240

Shah, Ghulam Mohammad, Kashmiri politician: 200, 202

Shah Shuja ul-Mulk, British imposed ruler of Afghanistan: 47–52, 53
 Shastri, Lal Bahadur, Prime Minister of India: 183, 240; Tashkent, 241–2
 Siachen Glacier: 237, 247–9, 256, 273, 274, 275
 Sialkot: connections with Jammu, 25, 137, 139, 153, 184, 188; 1965 war, 241
 Sikh Empire: 54–7; provinces, 56; succession issues, 57, 66; wars against British, 57–8
 Sikkim: 65, 113, 122, 136, 236; joins India, 286
 ‘Silk Route’: 20, 98; Karakoram Highway, 243
 Simla Agreement: 186, 246, 247, 263, 264; devolution as per Section 1.ii, 283
 Simla: Manifesto, 50; official talks with Tibet, 122
 Singh, Raja Amar, father of Hari Singh: 125–8, 129, 317 FN78; ruled 299
 Singh, Maharaja Dhalip, Emperor of Punjab: 72, 124, 126
 Singh, Raja Dhyan, Gulab Singh’s brother: background/ role in Sikh Empire, 60–1, 63–4, 66, 68; jagirs, 64; offspring seek British intercession, 128–9
 Singh, Raja/Maharaja Gulab, first ruler of J&K: 3, 4, 20, 22, 58, 285; Afghanistan, 66–7; armed forces/campaigns, 62–5, 68, 75; background/ role in Sikh Empire, 60–6, 68, 69; consolidating princely state, 86–90; installs Ranbir, 80–1; jagirs, 64; Ladakh, 121; lives in Srinagar, 34; male heirs, 126, 128; Poonch, 123, 312 FN91; purchase of Kashmir, 71–8, 132; relationship with British, 66–9; rivalry with Dhyan’s offspring, 129; ruled 299; ‘the worst native’, 71, 313 FN1
 Singh, Maharaja Hari, fourth ruler of J&K: 117, 118, 128, 140, 303; Abdullah, 197, 198–9; accession, 10, 147–8, 152–7, 177–182, 229; Gilgit Leased Area, 124; independence/‘Dograistan’, 152, 193; Muslim agitation against 1931, 131–2; Nehru, 133, 134; Mountbatten, 159–160; ‘Mr A’ blackmail incident, 128–9; political demise, 170–1, 191, 194; *Praja Sabha*, 131; Pratap Singh, 126, 128, 317 FN78; Pukhtoon invasion, 172, 175; Quit Kashmir, 132; Raja of Poonch, 123, 128–9; retrocession of Gilgit areas, 120; ruled, 299; State Subject status, 130; titles, 4, 128; vacillation on accession and effects, 163–170, 274
 Singh, Raja Hira, son of Dhyan Singh: 63–64, 68; jagirs, 64
 Singh, Karan, son of Hari Singh: 170–1, 317, FN78; dismisses Abdullah, 218, 220; ruled, 299
 Singh, Dr Manmohan, Prime Minister of India: 269, 270; almost resolves Kashmir dispute, 289
 Singh, Maharaja Pratap, third ruler of J&K: 81, 96, 124–129, 299; adopts Poonch Raja, 128; British Resident, 88; Council of State imposed on, 124–127; distaste for Hari Singh, 128–129, 317 FN78; lineage doubts, 126; ruled, 299
 Singh, Maharaja Ranbir, second ruler of J&K: 69, 80–1, 121; communicates with externals, 124; consolidates J&K, 89–91; lineage doubts re Pratap, 126; ruled, 299; supports British, 81, 100; treaties with Hunza, Nagar, 107; treaty with Chitral, 110
 Singh, Maharaja Ranjit, Emperor of Punjab: 38, 44–5, 49; death, 51, 54–5, 64; East India Company agreement with 1839, 48; eye for personal beauty, 61; Jammu, 87; post-Ranjit, 66–8, 285; relationship with Gulab/Dhyan Singh, 61–4; Russia, 46, 50; Shah Shuja/ Afghanistan, 47–8, 49, 50; Sikh Empire, 55–7
 Singh, Raja Suchet, brother of Gulab Singh: 63, 68, 80, 129; jagirs, 64
 Singh, General Zorawar, in Gulab Singh’s army: 65, 121
 Sinkiang (Xinjiang): 67, 90, 94–9, 102, 108, 109, 111, 112, 114, 115, 117, 118, 119, 124, 139, 232

Smith, Sydney, *Daily Express* reporter: [174–5](#)

South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation: [266](#); members, [328](#) FN13; possible federation, [287](#)

State Subjects of J&K: [129–130](#), [218](#); classes, [130](#), [181](#); diluted status in Gilgit-Baltistan, [218](#), [219](#), [222](#); Indian J&K and industry, [199](#); opening of LOC, [259](#); Pakistan elections, [214](#)

St Petersburg: [40](#); Treaty of: [96](#)

Sultan dynasty, Kashmir: [28](#); end, [32](#); Shihab-ud-Din's empire, [24](#)

Taliban: [16](#), [258](#), [267](#), [280–1](#), [289](#)

Terminology: [7–14](#)

Tibet/Xizang: Aksai Chin, [139–140](#); British interest, [90](#), [94](#), [98](#), [113–4](#); Gulab Singh's military campaigns, [64–5](#), [68](#); India, [232–4](#), [237](#); India recognises as part of China, [232](#), links with Ladakh, [20](#), [32](#), [140](#); loose borders, [95](#); maps, [93](#); rivers rising in, [55](#), [308](#) FN5, [325](#) FN51; size, [315–6](#) FN58; 'southern' Tibet, [237](#); 1914 treaty and India-Tibet border, [122–3](#)

Travancore: independence, [145–6](#), [151](#)

Turkestan/Turkistan (Land of the Turks): [20](#), [24](#), [38](#), [54](#), [68](#); Chinese/ eastern Turkestan, [94](#), [96](#), [98–9](#), [111](#), [115](#), [119](#); dynasties, [85–6](#); map, [93](#); Russia, [45](#), [83–6](#), [101](#), [104](#), [241–2](#); Tukharistan, [143](#); USSR, [116](#)

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR)/Soviet Union: [180](#), [236](#), [320](#) FN38; Communism, [234](#); creation, [114–5](#); Mongolia, [118](#); re-incorporates western Turkestan, [116](#); Tashkent talks, [241–2](#); Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation with India, [239](#); UNSC veto, [242](#), [263–4](#)

United Kingdom/London: Act of Union, [36](#); grants 'white' colonies dominion status, [78](#); India Act, [79–80](#); India-Pakistan links to, [147](#), [148](#); officials in/re India, [82–3](#); Pakistanis living in, [10](#), [215](#); size, [308](#) FN11; treaty re Tibet, [113–4](#)

United Nations (UN): [12](#), [265](#); apolitical maps, [121](#); ceasefire, [185](#), [209](#), [262](#), [303](#); East Timor referendum, [279](#), [286](#); General-Secretary re Rann of Kutch, [242](#); inability re plebiscite, [262](#), [274](#); India gets UN seat, [158](#); Northern Areas, [217](#); Simla Agreement, [183](#), [246–7](#), [264](#), [265](#); UN Representatives, [187](#), [224–6](#), [263–4](#)

United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan (UNCIP): established, [183–4](#), [262–3](#); fighting in J&K, [187](#); Northern Areas, [217](#); Pakistan's late reporting of military activity in J&K, [176](#); terminated, [224](#); terminology re J&K, [11–12](#), [308–9](#) FN3

United Nations Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan (UNMOGIP): [264](#), [327–8](#) FN6

United Nations Security Council (UNSC): Hyderabad question, [152](#); 'India-Pakistan question' (i.e. Kashmir dispute), [9](#), [183](#), [242](#), [261–2](#); [263–4](#); J&K and establishes UNCIP, [183–4](#), [262–3](#); plebiscite, [182–8](#), [263–4](#); use of veto, [242](#), [244](#), [263–4](#)

United States: [117](#), [236](#), [239](#), [243](#), [258](#), [267](#), [280](#), [307](#); Alaska, [313–4](#) FN13; decolonisation of Philippines [318](#) FN10; Kargil, [256–7](#)

Urdu: [129](#), [143](#), [319](#) FN18

Usmanistan (independent Hyderabad): [144](#), [151](#)

Vale of Kashmir: see [Kashmir Valley](#)

Vajpayee, Atal Behari, Prime Minister of India: [256](#), [266–7](#)

Victoria, Queen/Empress of UK: [50](#), [83](#), [86](#)

Wakhan/Wakhan Corridor: [20](#), [98](#), [100](#), [101](#), [104](#); Afghan buffer, [105–6](#), [118](#); Chitral's links, [109](#); Indian access, [289](#), [322](#) FN65

Wavell, Lord, Viceroy of India: [163](#), [318](#) FN13, [320](#) FN38

Younghusband, Francis, British soldier in J&K: [98](#), [104](#), [106](#), [108](#); China, [122](#); Russia, [133–5](#)

Zia-ul-Haq, General, Pakistan dictator: [183](#), [209](#), [246–7](#)